

The New York Tribune

SINCE THE CIVIL WAR

By

HARRY W. BAEHR, JR.

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty
of Political Science, Columbia University.

WITH A FOREWORD BY
ROYAL CORTISSOZ

With Illustrations

DODD, MEAD & COMPANY
NEW YORK

1936

COPYRIGHT, 1936
By DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY, INC.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED
NO PART OF THIS BOOK MAY BE REPRODUCED IN ANY FORM
WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM THE PUBLISHER

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE VAIL-BALLOU PRESS, INC., BINGHAMTON, N. Y.

TO JEAN
IN THE HOPE THAT IT WAS
ALL WORTH WHILE

FOREWORD

MR. BAEHR'S book appears within but a few years of the centenary of the newspaper with which it deals. The first issue of *The Tribune* was brought out by Horace Greeley on April 10th, 1841. Thus the *Herald Tribune* can look back upon a tradition whose longevity alone is testimony to its vital character. But that tradition connotes more than length of years. It is rooted in liberalism, in sustained dedication to the things of the mind and the spirit. When Greeley launched *The Log Cabin*, a slim, four-paged weekly foreshadowing *The Tribune*, he set up as his editorial slogan, "Spread the Truth," and the pages of the present work offer abundant evidence of the constructive energy with which that aim has ever since been pursued.

I stress the point in deprecation of the cry of "partisanship"—as though any newspaper, of any political faith, ever failed in ardor for its party. While there can be no question of *The Tribune's* having been essentially a source of Republican doctrine and opinion, I know, from having minutely traversed its files, early and late, that it has never shrunk from telling its party home truths. Indeed, as I have said elsewhere, it has been doing this, off and on, ever since the Republican party was invented, repeatedly coming out in flat opposition to party leaders especially on the ever-recurrent question of tariff schedules. Its policy of impartially presenting both sides of the case in the momentous campaign of 1936, under way as I write, has given renewed pledges of its fundamental independence. It has, moreover, upon more than one occasion, supported Democratic measures, notably certain of those advocated by Grover Cleveland. It is piquant also to recall an earlier episode, that of the aid and comfort given by the paper to Tilden in the gubernatorial campaign of 1874. That stalwart Democrat was so grateful, Whitelaw Reid once told me, that after his election he not only admitted to the editor of *The Tribune* that his influence had been controlling but wished to make some tangible recognition of the fact. He did so by granting all that Reid asked,

inserting in his inaugural message a passage committing the party to acceptance of the results of the war, particularly the sanctity of the debt and the binding nature of the constitutional amendments.

But I leave to the author the tale of "battles long ago" and of subsequent conflicts in the cause of good government. In this brief note I would touch rather upon the sterling significance of the paper as a purveyor of news—"Prompt news was the test of a paper's popularity" Greeley told a committee of the House of Commons in 1851—and upon the devoted ability of the men who have made this paper in old and more recent days. Godkin, whose political mood was hardly calculated to make him a sympathetic observer, thus recorded his impression when he was newly arrived in the United States, in Greeley's day: "The Tribune in particular excited my warm admiration. The staff was composed of men like Charles A. Dana, George Ripley, George William Curtis, and Bayard Taylor. . . . In fact, the paper was an institution more like the *Comédie Française* than anything I have known in the journalistic world." It has been ever thus. When, in 1899, Eastman Johnson's portrait of Whitelaw Reid was presented to the corporation by its employees, Reid observed: "I have often said that I did not dare to be proud of The Tribune. I do dare to be proud of its staff." Since his death in 1912 his son, Ogden Reid, has carried on in the same inspiring spirit.

ROYAL CORTISZOZ

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

As the *New York Tribune* approaches its centennial (for the *Herald Tribune* is the *Tribune*, augmented), a formal history of its career seems in order. To be perfectly logical, such a history should go back to that chill April day in 1841 which saw the first edition cried on the streets. But there is such a wealth of material already available on the first two decades of the newspaper that the author has felt constrained to begin with 1865, a year that marked the end of the *Tribune's* function as the evangel of abolition and the personal organ of Horace Greeley, and its real beginnings as a modern newspaper.

The great primary source for any newspaper history is, of course, the files. In addition, there are many volumes of memoirs which were valuable in bringing to life the anonymous personalities who compiled that staggering array of newsprint. But for whatever of color the author has been able to inject into this chronicle, his most sincere gratitude goes to the many living newspaper men who generously placed their time and experience at his disposal. He trusts that they will understand, and if necessary, pardon, the conclusions he has drawn from the facts they supplied.

For obvious reasons, it has been impossible to give direct citations for all of the information contained in this book. To give chapter and verse for every quotation from the *Tribune* would be wearisome and unprofitable, as the approximate date of such quotations may usually be determined from the context. Much of the information, also, was furnished on the understanding that the source remain confidential. A whole series of footnotes reading simply "Confidential Information," would be more of an annoyance than an aid to scholarship. The author has, therefore, confined the footnotes to citations from printed works, and from the letters of Horace Greeley, made available through the courtesy of his daughter Gabrielle Greeley Clendenin, and Henry A. Stahl, except where the point involved seemed to warrant more detailed

explanation. The principal sources, including those who supplied the confidential information, are listed in the bibliography.

The author wishes to make grateful acknowledgment to those who have quite literally made the book possible—to Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Reid, to Professor Allan Nevins of Columbia University, where the work had its inception, to Royal Cortissoz, and to Wilbur Forrest. His debt to them is not to be discharged in the narrow limits of a preface. Thanks are also due to many for courtesies and encouragement—to Geoffrey Parsons, D. G. Rogers, Arthur Draper, R. C. E. Brown, to Professor D. S. Muzzey who kindly read a portion of the manuscript and offered valuable suggestions, to Robert B. Duncan who gave assistance on points of law. The list is far too long to complete in this place. But the author cannot close without the hope that the work may be at least partially worthy of the patience and painstaking labor of one person. If *she* is satisfied . . .

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	vii
AUTHOR'S PREFACE	ix
PROLOGUE—APRIL 3, 1865	1
CHAPTER	
I BACKGROUNDS	3
II SEVENTY YEARS AGO	22
III THE HOUSE AFIRE	41
IV A NEW FORCE	67
V THE ROAD TO REVOLT	87
VI DIES IRAE	105
VII SALVAGE	124
VIII THE ADULLAMITES	145
IX ECONOMICS AND LABOR	175
X STALWART AND HALF-BREED	193
XI ENTER THE YELLOW PRESS	218
XII BRYAN—AND TOM PLATT	240
XIII THE REGENCY	265
XIV EXPERIMENTS	287
XV BELLIGERENT NEUTRALITY	301
XVI WAR	326
XVII BACK TO NORMALCY	351
XVIII BUILDING ON ROCK	371
XIX SEVENTY YEARS LATER	385
NOTE ON SOURCES	397
FOOTNOTES	402
INDEX	409

ILLUSTRATIONS

Horace Greeley	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	<small>FACING PAGE</small>
The Old Rookery	34
Whitelaw Reid	74
The Tall Tower	130
The <i>Tribune's</i> Bulletin Board	226
Ogden Mills Reid	274
The <i>Herald Tribune</i> Building	354
Helen Rogers Reid	386

PROLOGUE—APRIL 3, 1865

THE morning of April 3, 1865, witnessed a strange phenomenon in the city of Richmond, Virginia. Down Washington Street, lined by crowds of curious and sullen faces, marched a column of negro troops clad in blue, singing:

Oh, it mus' be dat de Kingdom Comin'
An' de year ob Jubilo!

News of the event sped quickly northward—to a tall, gaunt, bearded man at City Point; to harassed government officials at breakfast in Washington; to bankers in their Philadelphia offices. At noon, church bells in New York began to ring and artillery in City Hall Park roared out in salute. Crowds milled about Wall Street, cheering, singing. From a dozen buildings on Park Row a swarm of small boys issued, damp sheets of newsprint under their arms, shouting "Richmond has fallen!"

As the spring evening came on, excitement increased. The Astor House bar was filled with men in broadcloth and blue. From the hotel roof, sheaves of rockets went up. To the north stood the old City Hall, its dingy front bright with candlelight which was reflected in every window of every building facing the long triangle of the Park. The goal of four years of bloody warfare was achieved—Lee's ragged regiments were trailing off disconsolately to Appomattox, and freed slaves marched down the streets of the Confederate capital. "Richmond has fallen!"

On the corner of Park Row and Spruce Street stood a drab, square building, five stories in height. Its windows were lit with circlets of gas jets and across its façade ran a huge sign bearing, in letters four feet square, the name TRIBUNE.

This truly modest structure was the home of the greatest organ of public opinion in the United States, a newspaper which more than any other had set the stage for the event which the whole North was cheering—the *New-York Tribune*.

The fall of Richmond ended a unique period in the history of

the *Tribune*. In the twenty-four years which had elapsed since Horace Greeley founded it on April 10, 1841, it had risen to a position of commanding eminence, with a total circulation of nearly 300,000, distributed literally from Maine to California. No single American journal has since duplicated this feat, though many can now boast of circulations far larger—probably no American editor influenced his readers as did Horace Greeley, though many address greater audiences.

To the *Tribune*, as to the country at large, the end of the Civil War meant change—change in aims, methods and personnel. As the great journalistic proponent of Abolition, the paper had been carried to a position of the highest influence. The war was a bloody climax to the long crusade; when Southern resistance collapsed, much of the moral force of the crusade vanished with it. Horace Greeley had then to meet the problem of adjusting his organ to a national scene in which the stream of antislavery feeling would be diverted into many side currents, like a great river split into the narrow channels of its delta. To what extent, under such circumstances, would the special factors which had conditioned the *Tribune's* meteoric career in its first quarter-century continue to function?

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUNDS

THE *Tribune's* rise to preëminence in the American press before 1865 has often been ascribed solely to the personality of its founder, Horace Greeley. In the sense that the paper was largely a projection of this appealing and contradictory union of benevolence, irritability, shrewdness and *naïveté*, that journalistic commonplace is true. But in its absolute form it ignores an economic and cultural background which made possible the spread of one newspaper's influence across half a nation.

A great part of the *Tribune's* success was due to geography. Had Horace Greeley chosen to set up his press in Louisville, Kentucky, or Springfield, Massachusetts, he might have equaled or even eclipsed the success of the witty Prentice or the elder Samuel Bowles, but he could hardly have competed in influence with James Gordon Bennett or some other giant of the New York City press. For New York had become, by 1840, the "headquarters of intelligence for the continent," and for two decades its newspapers were to have a national influence which they have never since regained.

The city, possessing the initial advantage of the finest harbor on the Atlantic seaboard, had the greater blessing of a situation at the terminus of the Hudson-Mohawk valley, the "easiest route into the American continent."¹ As the settlement of the Old Northwest proceeded after 1815, it followed this route, aided successively by the Erie Canal and the New York Central Railroad. By 1860, "the region tributary to New York," comprising upstate New York, northern Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, northern Illinois and Wisconsin, "was a sufficient unit to bind the East to the West and maintain the Union."²

The primary effect of this magnificent economic empire upon the New York City press was to insure a prosperous local clientele. Journals which at the beginning of the century eked out

4 THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE SINCE THE CIVIL WAR

a precarious existence with the aid of political subsidies, found themselves thriving by the 'thirties. These rewards induced keen competition; worn-out methods were cast aside and editors extended themselves to capture the rich market which the city presented, while increasing revenues made ever greater enterprise in newsgathering possible.

One innovation in journalism was particularly valuable to the young *Tribune*. This was the institution of a cheap, popular press, and the first attempt at mass circulation. In 1830, the most important newspapers in the city were the *Courier and Enquirer*, the *Journal of Commerce*, the *Express*, the *Commercial Advertiser* and the *Evening Post*. At that time, the circulation of none of this group exceeded about 5,000. The papers were not sold on the streets, but by subscription at 6¢ a copy or \$10 a year. The tone of the whole group was predominantly political and commercial and the news outside of these fields was relatively neglected. The editorials were apt to be vigorous and personal, but in general the style of the sixpenny press was heavy and dull. Because of this, as well as the high price of the newspapers, a great mass of potential readers was left without a daily paper.

An attempt was made in 1833 by Dr. H. D. Shepard, a medical student, to appeal to this uncultivated market by the establishment of the *Morning Post*, a two cent daily. Two young typesetters, Francis Story and Horace Greeley, undertook the printing, but an almost complete lack of experience and capital on the part of all concerned brought about the demise of the venture in little over a fortnight.

Later in the same year, Benjamin Day, the owner of a printing office, founded the *Sun* to provide work for his presses. The *Sun* sold at 1¢, and the enterprising editor engaged boys to sell it to passers-by on the streets. A sort of *gamin* sprightliness characterized the paper, and, despite the fact that it was not remarkable except for this levity and its price, the *Sun* attained an almost instant popularity with the classes that could not afford the sixpennies. In less than ten years, it had a circulation estimated at 20,000.

Two years later, James Gordon Bennett, a Scotch immigrant of considerable experience in journalism but with only about \$500

capital, issued the first number of the *Herald*. This was patterned, as to price, methods of distribution and general style, on the *Sun*, but Bennett went further. He determined to compete, not only with the rival penny paper but with the prosperous six cent sheets, in the matter of news. Naturally at first financial stringency confined his exertions in this respect to the city itself, but here Bennett was soon supreme. Nothing was too trivial for the *Herald* if it might interest a reader. The editor's own marriage was written up in a fashion which excited both derision and disgust—but which drew attention to the *Herald*. By 1842, Bennett's paper had raised its price to 2¢, but still managed to sell 12,000 copies a day.

These pioneers of the popular press had shown that a cheap, smartly written newspaper which gave the news might be founded with little capital and hold its own against journals which had been established thirty years or more. The lesson was not lost on Horace Greeley.

Greeley began the publication of the daily *Tribune* on April 10, 1841. His qualifications as a competitor of Day and Bennett were numerous. Despite a none too robust constitution he was a hard worker, willing to put in the grueling hours which were necessary to get a morning paper on the streets before breakfast. His training had been hard, almost from the February morning in 1811 when he first saw the light of a New Hampshire day. His father, Zaccheus Greeley, was typical of many an American farmer, hard-working, optimistic and unlucky, edging slowly westward toward cheaper land and more laborious cultivation. At five, young Horace, though not a strong or healthy child, was assisting in the work of the little farm; at fifteen he was apprenticed to the publisher of a country weekly in East Poulteney, Vermont, the *Northern Spectator*. In the meantime, the bailiffs had come into the Greeley homestead at Amherst, New Hampshire, and Zaccheus had fled to Westhaven, Vermont, where he hired out as a laborer. When Horace was indentured, his family again moved, this time to the wilder lands of Western Pennsylvania.

Horace served five years as an apprentice, setting type, working the clumsy hand press and occasionally contributing articles. Then, after a *Wanderjahr* spent near his family's new home, he came to New York in 1831, with but \$10 in his pocket and the intention of

seeking work as a journeyman typesetter.

Greeley's early discipline stood him in good stead in the metropolis, and the ten years there which preceded the founding of the *Tribune* added greatly to his store of experience. Two years as a journeyman sufficed to gain enough capital to open his own job printing plant in partnership with Francis Story, and to begin the abortive but instructive publication of the *Morning Post*. After the collapse of this venture, Greeley stuck to his job press for a while, but on March 22, 1834, he began to publish a weekly periodical of "literature, politics, statistics and general intelligence," the *New-Yorker*. It was a very creditable attempt.

Greeley's schooling had been as sketchy as may be imagined from his poverty-straitened, overworked youth; it began in the little school near his birthplace and ended at the age of thirteen at a humble "Academy" of Westhaven. But the lad was precocious, learned to read at three and devoured every book that came within his reach. The *Northern Spectator* had been a good school in itself, and young Horace had entered actively into the debating society of East Poutleney. The early interest in literature and politics thus awakened was never lost.

In the *New-Yorker*, Greeley dealt with a great variety of subjects with all of the brashness and more than the skill usual to twenty-three. He speedily developed a style that, at its best, was clear and picturesque with flashes of real wit. His editorials even then were forceful and reflected thought. And though the paper was not financially successful (due in great part to lack of business ability), he attracted attention.

Thurlow Weed, the boss of the Whig party in New York State, wanted a man to edit a campaign weekly to press the claim of William H. Seward to the governorship. He "felt sure" that the editor of the *New-Yorker* "was a strong tariff man, and probably an equally strong Whig."³ So he asked Horace Greeley to undertake the task of editing the *Jeffersonian*. Greeley was so successful in the campaign of 1838 that he was given charge of a similar publication, the *Log Cabin*, in 1840. Like the *Jeffersonian*, the *Log Cabin* was sold below the cost of production and had but little advertising. Nevertheless, its *succès d'estime* was tremendous; as many as 80,000 copies of a single issue were distributed. Greeley

was thereby encouraged to continue the weekly as a personal venture, along with the *New-Yorker*, after it had served its primary purpose in aiding the election of General William Henry Harrison in November, 1840.

The daily *Tribune*, then, had on its first appearance the benefit of an editor of astonishing versatility, considering his years, and one who clearly saw the opportunities which his own talents and the pioneering work of Ben Day and Bennett opened in the field of metropolitan journalism.

The *Sun* and the *Herald* were early examples of that successful sensationalism which attracts large circulations but arouses a certain repulsion in a large class of readers. Greeley had a strong moral sense; he was, at the outset, at least, averse to the practice of featuring crime news. Moreover he shared the fairly common prejudice of his time against the theater. The *Tribune's* prospectus in the *Log Cabin* of April 3, 1841 announced that

The immoral and degrading police reports, advertisements, and other matter which have been allowed to disgrace the columns of our leading penny papers, will be carefully excluded from this, and no exertion will be spared to render it worthy of the hearty approval of the virtuous and refined, and a welcome visitant at the family fireside.

The "virtuous and refined" found it possible to purchase for 2¢ (the *Tribune's* original price of 1¢ was raised on April 11, 1842) a newspaper whose good taste was the equal of the best of the six-penny sheets. In consequence, the *Tribune* had from the start a measure of better class patronage.

The *Tribune* had another advantage on which Greeley based high hopes. New York City has been predominantly Democratic throughout its history, but it has always offered a field to a certain number of opposition papers. In 1841, the Whig press was confined to the sixpennies. The *Sun* and *Herald* were avowedly independent, but in fact they inclined very noticeably toward the Democrats. Greeley had been a Whig since his service on the *Northern Spectator*, and his principles had crystallized during his editorship of the *Jeffersonian* and the *Log Cabin*. He was in practical alliance with Thurlow Weed and William H. Seward and counted on Whig financial support to get his journal under way. He was, and re-

mained almost to the end of his days a firm believer in the party system and the party press. "My leading idea," he said in his autobiography, "was the establishment of a journal alike removed from servile partizanship on the one hand and from gagged, mincing neutrality on the other." ⁴

Greeley remained sound on the primary tenets of the Whig party, urging them with great force and vigor in his editorials. He was a profound, even affectionate, admirer of Henry Clay, whose "American System" he adopted wholeheartedly—tariff protection for industry balanced by government aid in internal improvements and a liberal public land policy for the farmer. On the tariff, Greeley was soon considered a foremost authority, Thurlow Weed acclaiming him as second only to Hezekiah Niles in knowledge of the subject. The *Tribune* also was prominent in demanding a Pacific Railroad and the free distribution of national lands to *bona fide* settlers. In addition, Greeley continually urged sound money and sound banking laws.

But the *Tribune* was too independent on questions of individual candidates to be quite "regular." Greeley once wrote to Weed that he acted "without reference" to the "political bearings" of a subject,⁵ and the *Tribune* was one of the first to take leave of the Whig party in that majestic breakup which followed the election of 1852. This independence caused the *Tribune* and its editor to be distrusted in orthodox party circles and led to many violent verbal duels between that paper and others of the same avowed political allegiance.

Moreover, the part played by political ideas in the upbuilding of the daily *Tribune* was restricted by the relative lack of interest on the part of its subscribers. In 1851, Greeley testified that the leading article did not have the importance in this country that it possessed in England. With us, he said, "The telegraphic dispatch is the great point."⁶ Using "telegraphic dispatch" in the sense of "spot news" in general, this statement implies that the daily *Tribune* had to meet and excel its competitors in the field of news-gathering—which it did with great success. The prospectus of the new daily promised that it would "contain the news by the morning's Southern Mail, which is contained in no other Penny Paper," and this initial stroke of enterprise was followed by many others.

In the early period, before the spread of telegraph, cable and railroad lines, getting the news ahead of alert rivals was a matter of great hardship and expense. On one occasion, the *Tribune* ran an "express" all the way from Halifax to New York—by carriage, steamboat and rail—only to be beaten by the *Herald*. Reports of the events of the Mexican War went from New Orleans to Petersburg, Virginia, by pony express and thence by wire to New York—a method which required nearly two months for transmission.

Greeley's zeal for the news built up a fine staff of correspondents. Charles A. Dana, who joined the staff in 1847, went to Europe the following year to report the course of the Revolutions of 1848, returning to become managing editor, a post which he held until 1862. Bayard Taylor also acted as European correspondent, editorial writer and literary critic. He was the only newspaperman with Perry's expedition, which opened Japanese trade to the world. Karl Marx wrote letters from London during the 'fifties on the state of Europe. Moncure D. Conway was another London correspondent during the Civil War.

The American struggle gave a great opportunity to American newspapers, which they were not slow to turn to account. In the interval between Lincoln's election and his inauguration, Albert D. Richardson represented the *Tribune* in the South, a position which might have cost his life, so unpopular was the paper in that section. By preserving a strict incognito he managed to survive. Later, while acting as *Tribune* correspondent with Grant's army on the Mississippi, Richardson was not so fortunate. With Junius H. Browne, another *Tribune* man, and Richard T. Colburn of the *World*, he was captured by the Confederates. Colburn was soon released but the *Tribune* representatives were confined in Southern prisons for eighteen months until they succeeded in making a sensational escape to the Union lines.

George Washburne Smalley was another *Tribune* correspondent to gain fame in the Civil War. He was with the Army of the Potomac when McClellan met Lee at Antietam, carried dispatches for a general and saw the whole action. When Lee at last drew off his defeated columns, Smalley made a hazardous night ride of thirty miles to Frederick, Maryland, the nearest telegraph office. On his arrival at three in the morning, the office was closed and the dis-

patcher was in bed. Finally Smalley succeeded in getting a bulletin on the wires, but instead of going to the *Tribune* office in New York, it was sent to the War Department at Washington, giving Lincoln his first news of the battle that made the Emancipation Proclamation possible. Smalley, unaware of this, proceeded by rail to New York, writing his account on the cars, and, after all, the *Tribune* got on the streets with six columns about the victory before any of its competitors.

When Smalley, as a reward for his exploit, was promoted to the editorial staff, his place with the Army of the Potomac was taken by an energetic German immigrant, Henry Villard, the railroad magnate of later years. Villard upheld the paper's reputation well, assisted by others of lesser fame. One *Tribune* correspondent is said to have been kissed by Lincoln for bringing a bit of cheerful news.⁷ Another was the only correspondent present at the capture of Richmond. Bennett's *Herald* was probably the most enterprising and successful newspaper in reporting this war, but assuredly the *Tribune* was not far behind.

In political reporting, the *Tribune* may claim the first rank during the ante-bellum years. Greeley's extensive contacts with party leaders was invaluable and he frequently acted as correspondent at Washington and at conventions. James S. Pike was Washington correspondent during the 'fifties, and Samuel Wilkeson during the war. The editor of the *Tribune* was insistent that local news should not supersede items of national importance. In 1856 he wrote to Dana upbraiding him for crowding out a dispatch on congressional affairs in favor of a divorce case:

My letter would have been middling on Saturday while it will be sour as whey and flat as cold dishwater on Monday; while the Griswold business would have been rolled as a sweet morsel under the tongues of all the old maids of New York any day you might see fit to print it.⁸

The *Tribune* was particularly strong in certain fields of reporting which lay outside the ken of most newsmongers of his day. Book reviewing was on a higher plane in that paper than in even the *Evening Post*, which had William Cullen Bryant as editor. Margaret Fuller, Bayard Taylor and George Ripley contributed sound and authoritative criticisms. *Barnaby Rudge* and *Little*

Dorrit were printed for lovers of Dickens, and the correspondence from abroad did not neglect literary news. Dramatic criticism was long slighted, due to Greeley's suspicions of the moral effect of the theater, but music was ably treated by William H. Fry, a composer of symphonies and opera as well as a political writer of some note.

In one respect at least Greeley was in advance of his time, and gave the *Tribune* a distinct character. As he wrote to his managing editor:

I want to have less and less to do with politics and more and more with Productive Industry. I feel that the path of Empire—journalistic and all other—stretches in this direction. Let us be first to act on this knowledge, it will win few subscribers today, but it will win character which may ultimately be coined, if that is deemed essential.⁹

The *Tribune* therefore gave particular attention to agricultural science and reports of new inventions. Greeley himself was a "scientific farmer" on his little estate at Chappaqua, New York, and though his experiments with draining and subsoil plowing irresistibly conjure up the image of Jorrocks and Pigg at Hillingdon Hall, his writings on the subject are admittedly sound. The regular *Tribune* agricultural editors, Solon Robinson and N. C. Meeker, were popular and acknowledged authorities. Greeley's intention of having an "editor with respect to Inventions" was never quite carried out on the scale that he intended; war, followed by a change in public taste, hindered the full growth of the innovation; but in this, as in all other fields of "Productive Industry," the *Tribune* did its utmost to keep abreast of the news.

With such substantial fare, served as it was in a plain, neat style, the *Tribune* made a successful appeal to its New York subscribers. Horace Greeley turned out a good daily newspaper; his notions of journalism were idealistic but sound; he supervised their execution with great care and selected able assistants. But it must be admitted that the personality of the man formed a piquant sauce to the dish.

Greeley was one of the most perplexing and yet appealing figures of his day. The perplexity is not the result of lack of information as to his character or thought. On the contrary, he wore his mind as well as his heart on his sleeve and was the "most autobiographical of editors."¹⁰ Personal affairs, tastes, doubts, fears and ideas in

flux appeared in his lectures and his editorials with an emphasis equal to his most reasoned convictions. This lack of selectivity is the chief cause of whatever debate the personality of Horace Greeley has occasioned.

Men read in the *Tribune* his frequent outbursts of querulousness against public figures on whose shoulders great responsibilities rested. Lincoln, to name the most prominent, suffered from this trait of the editor. Greeley, torn between his very real horror of bloodshed and the dominating courage of his managing editor, was led, half-unwillingly, into sustaining the appeal to arms after Sumter and into an attempt to force the national government into decisive action by reiterating the cry "Forward to Richmond." The tragi-comedy of Bull Run raised a wave of anger against the *Tribune* and its founder which caused the latter much anguish of mind. Nevertheless he persisted in "advising" Lincoln, moved by mistrust of the President's abilities throughout the war—seeking, as in the famous editorial "The Prayer of Twenty Millions," to achieve emancipation before Lincoln felt the time ripe; urging the postponement of the Union Republican convention of 1864 and even toying with the idea of Lincoln's withdrawal from the Presidential race two months before election; appealing, in 1862, to the French ambassador to urge the intervention of his Emperor to bring about peace, and taking part himself in an attempt to treat with the Confederates at Niagara Falls two years later.

But balanced against this ill-advised meddling were many instances of stalwart support, of editorials which rallied thousands to the cause of the Union. The frequent signs of panic, when faced by the logical action flowing from his own words, awakened contempt in many less emotional or coarser-fibered men, but it was set off by the uncomplaining courage with which Greeley sustained a violent physical attack by a Southern Congressman, and faced the prospect of murder during the Draft Riots of 1863.

Some, notably Ralph Waldo Emerson, considered Greeley as both "coarse and cunning."¹¹ The publication of Greeley's letter dissolving "the firm of Seward, Weed and Greeley" after his successful opposition to Seward in the Chicago convention of 1860 was regarded by many as proof that the editor was a disappointed place-hunter who had achieved a mean revenge. Yet Greeley's

personal benevolences were equally well known; he was so free with his money in humanitarian projects and in loans to individuals as to damage seriously his private fortune. Probably all that saved the *Tribune* from a similar fate was his selection of Thomas McElrath, a lawyer and book publisher, as his partner and business manager. McElrath purchased a half-interest in the concern in July, 1841, and gave it a "safe and judicious" ¹² business administration for over ten years.

The very human figure which Greeley's frankness and the malice of his contemporaries brought prominently before the public was made even more so by the subject's eccentricities of appearance and manner. Greeley described himself in 1841 as "Tow-headed, and half-bald at that . . . long-legged, gaunt and most cadaverous of visage . . . slouching in dress; goes bent like a hoop, and so rocking in his gait that he walks down both sides of the street at once." ¹³ In addition, he was absent-minded, often *gauche* in society and addicted to wearing an old light frieze coat and a high white hat. His voice was high and thin and his language frequently coarse enough to form the foundation for many stories of the smoking room variety. Yet this unattractive picture was redeemed by an expression of sweetness and benevolence that attracted both close friends and the chance audiences of his frequent lectures. And in time, the bent figure shuffling along under an old white coat, with pockets stuffed with papers, the round face oddly fringed with whiskers and topped with an old white hat, the general air of disarray, all became a homely symbol of the man and his newspaper.

Had the *Tribune* been merely a metropolitan daily, Greeley's almost exaggerated humanity would not have served him so well. But the *Tribune's* great strength before 1865 lay in a sphere where such idiosyncrasies were better appreciated. After all, the circulation of the daily *Tribune*, though it mounted to 45,000 before the Civil War, and during that struggle, despite an increase in price to 3¢ in 1862 and to 4¢ in 1865, to as much as 90,000 on exceptional days, never succeeded in equaling the circulation of the daily *Herald*. It was even surpassed by that of the daily *Times*—a Whig newspaper founded by one of Greeley's former assistants, Henry J. Raymond, expressly to cater to the class that found the *Tribune's*

free-thinking and free-speaking unpalatable.

The *Tribune*, then, though very important, was never first in New York City. But to the northwest, far beyond the city limits, spread a territory which was rapidly being settled along the line of the Hudson valley, the Mohawk and the Great Lakes. Easy communication with the city on Manhattan Island created the prosperity of New York, and it also made the new agricultural regions more or less dependent on the city for news as well as more substantial items. True, newspapers sprang up rapidly in the villages and towns from Albany to Chicago, but their product was slim and unsatisfactory to an intellectually alert population.

The New York City press possessed other advantages than those directly attributable to its situation in a wealthy community. As New York and its hinterland grew, lines of communication with Europe and the rest of the Atlantic seaboard tended to converge upon the city. The first important line of packet ships opened service between New York and Liverpool in 1816. Steamships followed in 1838, bringing immigrants and intelligence to the city. The telegraph arrived in 1846. Wall Street gained the financial ascendancy over State Street and Market Street. The Middle Western press, unable to afford the expense of telegraph fees or of maintaining local correspondents, were dependent on the New York papers for a large share of the news of the world.

The metropolitan press was quick to appreciate the advantage it enjoyed, and profited both collectively and individually. In 1849, ten of the larger New York dailies, including the *Tribune*, formed the Associated Press. Originally this organization was designed to reduce the cost of maintaining competitive dispatch boats in the harbor for the purpose of meeting incoming ships, but it soon took on wider territory as a true coöperative newsgathering group, pooling the results and expenses of its members' activities and maintaining joint wire services, correspondents and expresses. Part of the expenses were defrayed by selling the service to papers not in the association, throughout the country.

Such aid as the newspapers of the new states and territories received from this source came in the form of condensed and bald summaries, and even at that many of the smaller sheets were unable to sustain the expense. A newspaper mailed direct from New York

had a powerful appeal. Since a daily was too long in arriving, as well as too expensive for the majority of rural readers, the weekly was a logical development.

Greeley, in his conduct of the *Jeffersonian*, and especially of the *Log Cabin*, learned to appreciate this state of affairs, for these political weeklies had a wide circulation throughout New York State as a whole and even beyond its boundaries. Moreover, he knew the temperament of the villager, his interest in public affairs and the part which the local debating society played in his life. Therefore on September 20, 1841, Greeley merged the *New-Yorker* and the *Log Cabin* into a weekly edition of the *Tribune* and thereby found his true audience.

For Horace Greeley was above all an editorial writer, at his best in vigorous and plausible statements of opinion. He loved controversy and, if he often descended to personalities, gave the lie direct and addressed his adversaries by opprobrious names running the gamut from "villain" to "low-mouthed, blatant, witless, brutal scoundrel," that was a common fault of the age. In terse, eminently quotable phrases which drove home a message, or in sonorous verbiage which awakened memories of the King James Version, Greeley was a master of editorial dialectic.

To his unrivaled stylistic equipment, Greeley added a warm heart and an open mind. The American of his time, especially the American on the farm and frontier, was in a state of emotional and intellectual ferment. In part this was due to the importation of humanitarian ideals from Europe, where the ice of the *Ancien Régime* had been violently broken by the French Revolution. In part, also, it was due to a feeling that America was the land of promise, where all things new and hopeful were possible. Then again, it may have been malarial fever. Whatever the cause, new projects for ameliorating the lot of the world, experiments in religion and government, new values in literature and philosophy were embraced or eagerly discussed. And if Greeley's receptivity to Fourierite Socialism, vegetarianism, Universalism and Transcendentalism (to name only a few of the *Tribune's* "isms") seemed radical to the already somewhat sophisticate New Yorker, they were only a part of the febrile intellectual background of the frontier, which included the primitive religiosity of revivals, the Millerite Ascension

movement and Joseph Smith.

The weekly *Tribune* did not have to compete with Bennett's energetic newsgathering. It contained a summary of the news of the week "excluding all matter of local or transitory interest." Agricultural news and advice were featured, of course, but the great attraction was the editorial. Greeley gathered a fine staff of writers about him, whose influence was undoubtedly great in determining the paper's course—Charles A. Dana, Richard Hildreth, Charles T. Congdon, William H. Fry, Bayard Taylor, Beman Brockway, Sidney Howard Gay, James S. Pike—but thanks to the publicity achieved by Greeley's odd mannerisms, his lecture tours and the very real genius of the man, Greeley was the *Tribune* to his rural constituency. They turned to the paper to see what "old Horace" had to say on the state of the nation.

Greeley's political ideas have already been discussed. They were quite conservative—nothing more radical than may be found on the *Herald Tribune's* editorial page today. In politics Greeley had a streak of realism which often inclined him to pessimism. He was a student of political statistics; in 1837 he began the publication of the *Whig Almanac and Political Register*, a valuable annual compilation of election data and important legislation which, as the *Tribune Almanac*, reappeared periodically until 1910. A mistake in an election return was one thing that the *Tribune's* founder could not abide. But the realism which he applied to practical politics did not hinder Greeley from visualizing an ambitious program of social reform.

One of the most comprehensive features of this program was Association, the Socialism of Charles Fourier, to which Greeley was introduced by Albert Brisbane. As propounded by Greeley, this was not Marxian Socialism. At the base lay an assertion of the right of every man to work productively, plus an attempt to reduce waste by coöperative housing, schooling and cooking. Labor, skill and capital were each to be rewarded in proportion to their contributions, and the scheme was not to be initiated or aided by the state but by voluntary associations. Greeley gave time and money to the advancement of this plan, notably in the experimental colonies (called phalanxes) at Brook Farm, Massachusetts, the North American Phalanx in New Jersey and a somewhat similar scheme,

organized by his agricultural editor, N. C. Meeker, at Greeley, Colorado.

The *Tribune*, in 1842, sold a column to Albert Brisbane in which to state the case for Association, and Greeley occasionally supported the principle in his editorials. But the paper practically abandoned the subject after a debate between its editor and Henry J. Raymond, formerly Greeley's assistant and later founder of the *Times*, but then on the staff of the *Courier and Enquirer*. Raymond was credited with the victory, but it is plain to a dispassionate reader today that he won by a bit of dialectical *chicane*, drawing a red herring of morality across the economic trail and triumphantly proving that the *Tribune*, in supporting the right of married women to their own property, was breaking up the American home and leading to a carnival of license. However, though Greeley continued to believe in the rightness of his brand of Socialism and to support it privately, the *Tribune* turned to a less radical form of economic betterment.

This was Coöperation. Greeley urged the formation of industrial unions, was, in fact, the first president of Typographical Union No. 6, but his advocacy was based less on the Union as a means to joint bargaining than as a nucleus for coöperative effort—whereby labor might set up its own factories and compete with capitalistic concerns. The strike was always repugnant to Greeley, as involving violence which he feared and waste which he detested. In proof of his sincerity, Greeley attempted to turn the *Tribune* into a coöperative enterprise in 1849. The firm was made a “copartnership” with a capital of \$100,000 (a very low figure, considering the annual income) divided into 100 shares. Twenty-six shares were sold to members of the editorial, mechanical and publishing staffs—payment in some cases being made from accruing dividends. This gave employees a valuable stake in the enterprise, but as time went on, stock was bought or inherited by outsiders, and the original coöperative scheme was lost in something closely approaching a commercial corporation.

Of more immediate concern to the rural subscribers of the *Tribune* was its editor's interest in their own problems. This, as expressed in the advancement of agricultural science, improvement of communications and public land policies has already been noted.

In addition, Greeley had an almost mystic belief in the future of the West, and in landowning as a source of independence. He regarded city life as apt to be morally weakening and wage-earning as only a way station toward a freer life. Something of this may be found in his famous saying "Go West, young man, and grow up with the country," which he phrased less pithily in the *New-Yorker*:

If any young man is about to commence the world, with little in his circumstances to prepossess him in favor of one section above another, we say to him publicly and privately, Go to the West; there your capacities are sure to be appreciated and your industry and energy rewarded.

Greeley even welcomed unemployment in cities, as tending to drive men to the purer atmosphere of the farm. This was flattering to the rustic and added greatly to the *Tribune's* prestige in the country.

There were many other subjects which came under Greeley's questing eye and contributed to the grist of discussion in country store or village lyceum. As he wrote in the *Tribune* during its first year of existence, "We have a number of requests to blow up all sorts of abuses which shall be attended to as fast as possible." The *Tribune* favored opening professions to women, giving them control of their property after marriage and even conceded their logical right to vote. As "Rights for Women" was a movement which included advocates of less rigid marital relations, Greeley was accused of supporting free love, though as a matter of fact, his conception of the marriage bond was extremely strict. Temperance was the subject of much debate in the 'forties and Greeley was firmly convinced that alcohol was a poison which should be outlawed by statute. He consistently opposed capital punishment and the flogging of seamen in the navy.

Naturally, opinion was divided on all of these subjects and doubtless Greeley's forthrightness made as many enemies as friends—though it is said that the weekly *Tribune* was often subscribed to by those who wished to disagree with its sentiments. But the discussions over the annexation of Texas saw the real beginnings of a great movement in the North, which was to canalize all the exuberant humanitarianism of that section into one raging torrent. And

the *Tribune* rode this flood.

The attitude of Horace Greeley toward negro slavery was not always that of the man who wrote "The Prayer of Twenty Millions." It is true that he was opposed to the institution from boyhood, a natural result of his New England upbringing. But in the *New-Yorker*, in 1834, he expressed the belief that the situation of slavery had not altered since the formation of the Constitution; that the compromise then achieved was wise; and that there was no pressing need to alter it.

Why should not the existing evils of one section be left to the correction of its own wisdom and experience when pointed out by the unerring finger of experience?

In the first volume of the *Tribune* is another editorial in which Greeley contrasts the evils of slavery and rum, in such fashion as to leave no doubt that he felt the latter called for more urgent treatment. Two incidents, said Greeley in his autobiography, were chiefly responsible for his change of attitude—one, the slaying of Elijah P. Lovejoy at Alton, Illinois, in 1837, which gave tragic proof of the danger to freedom of speech and press implicit in the slavery controversy, and the other, the annexation of Texas, which revealed the possibility that the South would upset the delicate balance of the Missouri Compromise.

It was the second of these episodes that resolved Greeley's doubts and fears and brought him into open conflict with the slave power. It was a national issue in the election of 1844, and while Greeley at first attempted to shelve discussion out of deference to Henry Clay's conciliatory views, the defeat of Clay in November left him free to speak his mind. On November 28, 1844, the *Tribune* editorial read:

Briefly, then, we stand on the ground of *Opposition to the Annexation of Texas so long as a vestige of slavery shall remain within her borders.*

From that point on, the *Tribune* rapidly swung into place as the leading journalistic opponent of any extension of slavery. By 1856, the paper was indicted in Harrison County, Virginia, for inciting to insurrection; in the Draft Riots of 1863, its office was mobbed because of its long and vigorous fight for the negro.

There were waverings, to be sure. Greeley accepted the Compromise of 1850 and the candidacy of General Scott in 1852. Then, after leading in the denunciation of Stephen A. Douglas for the doctrine of "squatter sovereignty" embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and leading in the formation of the Republican Party and in its first campaign in 1856, Greeley became fearful as 1860 approached, talked of Douglas for President and actually worked for the nomination of Edward Bates, a slaveholder, in the convention of that year. His course in the Civil War has already been referred to.

These occasional lapses were due partly to a certain weakness in the editor and partly to the fact that his assistants sometimes carried the paper farther than he wished. His letters to Charles A. Dana in 1856 show him eager to restrain his colleagues, to prevent them from being more "fiery" than he was himself, to restrict them to ferocity "judiciously applied."

And I charge you above all things not to allow anything to get in which seems impelled by hatred of the South or a desire to humiliate that section. On the contrary, ours is the course to renovate and exalt the South and must be so commended.¹⁴

Nevertheless, when one of his assistants carried matters to extremes (and Greeley confessed to John Russell Young later that "I never opened the *Tribune* in those days without a terror as to what they might make me say after 11 o'clock at night")¹⁵ the editor usually sustained his subordinates. As Greeley was absent rather frequently on lecture tours, trips to Washington, to the West and to Europe, this loyalty was often tried. Charles T. Congdon claims that Richard Hildreth was more radical than Greeley in his desire to see slavery overthrown;¹⁶ John Russell Young, that George Ripley and Sidney Gay carried Greeley into the anti-slavery movement (this is hardly accurate, since Gay joined the *Tribune* after the paper's course was decided);¹⁷ James Wilson, that Dana was responsible for the *Tribune's* stand for coercion of the South after Sumter;¹⁸ Henry Wilson, that Gay kept his chief in line for the Union during the war.¹⁹

The fact of the matter seems to be that Greeley, once aroused, yielded to no man in his detestation for slavery as an institution,

but that his constitutional hatred of bloodshed and his belief in the power of public opinion often led him to oppose measures which seemed likely to bring about armed conflict. His more impetuous colleagues frequently committed the *Tribune* to the support of such measures, and Greeley sustained them.

At all events, the *Tribune's* reputation as a foremost opponent of slavery was well established, despite its occasional wavering. The importance of this issue to the paper is demonstrable: whereas the daily *Tribune* barely kept pace with the more orthodox *Times*, and never quite overtook the *Herald*—which was anti-abolition—the weekly *Tribune's* circulation soared steadily as the fight grew hotter. In 1849 its circulation was twice that of the daily—27,950; by 1854 it was 112,000; during the war it surpassed 200,000.

Other New York newspapers had followed Greeley's lead in setting up weekly editions, but none even approached the *Weekly Tribune* in circulation. In 1868, when the national influence of the New York press had passed its peak, the *Tribune* had well over twice as many weekly subscribers as its closest competitor, the *World*, which in turn had over three times as many as the weekly *Times*. In 1861, the *Weekly Tribune* had about 50,000 readers in New York State, nearly the same number in New England, and over 90,000 in the Middle West. Well might James Ford Rhodes write:

I can emphatically say that if you want to penetrate into the thoughts, feelings and grounds of decision of the 1,866,000 men who voted for Lincoln in 1860, you should study the New York *Weekly Tribune*. . . .²⁰

CHAPTER II

SEVENTY YEARS AGO

THE end of the war meant more to the *Tribune* than a victory over the slave power. It meant the loss of the motive force supplied by a great cause, and with it, the virtual loss of its growth as a national newspaper. Consequently, serious changes took place in the internal affairs of the paper.

In the Middle West, new daily newspapers had sprung into prominence during the hostilities, when an impatient public found the summaries of the New York weekly too meager and too slow. The *Chicago Tribune*, the *Toledo Blade*, the *Cincinnati Commercial* formed dangerous competition in their localities. Growing ease of communication, improved service by the Associated Press, the need for purely local organs—all militated against the *Tribune* in the field of its greatest achievements. The advantage of geographical position had at last been neutralized.

In New York City, the outlook was more promising. Horace Greeley's principal competitors were James Gordon Bennett's *Herald* and the *Times* of Henry J. Raymond. The *Herald* was unquestionably first in circulation among American dailies, thanks to its vigorous pursuit of the news. There was a *Herald* wagon with every Union Army, and failure to beat a competitor with a story meant instant dismissal. But Bennett was older than Greeley, and his son James Gordon, Jr., was as yet untried.

Raymond, a far younger man than either Greeley or Bennett, was destined to die before either of his seniors—in June, 1869. Meanwhile his newspaper had fallen somewhat in circulation and was due to lose more subscribers through the course which its editor pursued in the politics of Reconstruction.

The *Sun* was in a temporary eclipse. It had been managed for a short time as a religious daily, and had suffered in consequence. Moses S. Beach, the owner of the paper, had resumed the editorship and was struggling to regain the ground lost. Not until 1868

was Charles A. Dana to become editor, and to bring the *Sun* to its zenith of power.

The *World*, edited by Manton Marble, called the "best written and least read paper" in New York,¹ and the *Evening Post*, headed by the patriarchal William Cullen Bryant, had each their following but were not serious rivals of the *Tribune*. The *World* circulated among wealthy and cultured Democrats and was prosperous. The *Evening Post* found its readers in a similar class of Republicans and enjoyed a similar prosperity. Neither had very large daily circulations, though the *World* claimed, in 1868, a weekly circulation of 75,000.

The daily field then, was open to a vigorous newspaperman. But in the *Tribune*, as Charles A. Dana wrote in 1854, "the *Daily Tribune*, as such has never made a cent, but has existed solely that something might be made on the weekly and semi-weekly."² The management found food for thought in the financial statements of 1864.

The war had made terrific demands in the way of competition for news. The New York press had its agents following the armies and racing each other for the honor of a "beat" and the circulation which was its material reward. And though the *Tribune* received through its enterprise a generous share of both *éclat* and following, the financial return was hardly in keeping with the effort applied. Telegraphing and correspondence increased the cost of production hugely. Salaries rose—some of the typesetters made as much as \$70 a week, or more than Charles A. Dana ever received as managing editor of the *Tribune*³—while the price of print paper, normally the greatest single item of expense, skyrocketed dizzily. By 1864, it had doubled over 1861, and though the *Tribune* raised its own price from 2¢ a copy to 4¢, the receipts of the paper in the last year of the war were \$747,501, as against expenses of \$735,751.⁴ It was reasonable to suppose that the high costs of war time would diminish, but a news-hungry public, stimulated by the sensational events of the past four years, would also demand ever greater exertion on the part of the press to satisfy its craving.

To meet these changing conditions, the *Tribune* in 1865 presented an organization which revealed signs of old age. The paper's home itself was eloquent testimony to twenty years of hard service.

Originally innocent of any architectural charm, the five story "dry-goods box," which had arisen in 1845 on the corner of Spruce and Nassau Streets, after fire gutted the cradle of the paper at 30 Ann Street, had also become woefully inadequate for the needs of the great paper it housed. The presses were in an unwholesome dingy cellar, the editorial and city rooms were crowded beyond comfort.

Here, in a tiny study on the second floor, Horace Greeley crouched over his desk, driving a furious pen in weird hieroglyphics over the page. At fifty-four he labored as strenuously as at thirty. The thin blond hair was white and scant, an odd ruff of whisker curled from beneath the chin and framed a face "round as the moon on her thirteenth night," like an untidy halo. The "old white coat," beloved of cartoonists, no longer hung on its peg; sober blacks draped a paunchy frame. It is the figure of a man just past his prime.

This statement is true in more than a physical sense. Greeley's great task had been to stir the moral indignation of the North to resistance to slavery. The bloody work of eliminating that institution by force from the continent had not been to his taste; it had frayed his nerves and set him desperately seeking an end, a way out. His prestige suffered. There was friction among the *Tribune* stockholders when Charles A. Dana, the exponent of force, retired in 1862. Lincoln, though he retained faith in the editor, retorted to his criticisms publicly, with great effect. The mass of *Tribune* readers who had followed Greeley through the antislavery campaign, who asked his advice on every conceivable subject, were beginning to lose faith in their oracle. The proof was still in the future, but Greeley, unconsciously, was a pathetic figure in 1865; loved but not wholly trusted—a man who had outlived his time.

Greeley was peculiarly sensitive to censure, considering the amount of abuse which was the normal portion of an editor in his day. The unfortunate episode of 1861, when the *Tribune's* slogan of "Forward to Richmond" was blamed for the catastrophe of Bull Run, had induced in the editor an agony of self-reproach and nights of sleeplessness. The course of the war, the mounting casualty lists and the opprobrium which followed the editor's well-meaning attempts at terminating the bloodshed tended to increase the strain on Greeley's nerves. Associates, after the peace, found him more

querulous, more suspicious—though still at bottom loyal to the men whom he had raised to positions of trust.

There is no doubt that Greeley was at this time growing rebellious at the chains which bound him to his desk. He whose pen had wrought so well in freeing the slaves, was in his own phrase, "the slave of a newspaper,"⁵ and his letters reveal a growing dissatisfaction with that condition. In 1867, he avowed his intention of retiring, in a letter to Whitelaw Reid:

. . . I believe you are mistaken as to my withdrawing from the active direction of the *Tribune* in 1869. I guess I shall be able to do it. At all events I hope to try.⁶

Thus it seems probable that the drastic reorganization of the *Tribune* which occurred in the late 'sixties was in part the result of the editor's craving for freedom and his intention of placing the paper in the best position possible against the time when that craving should be gratified.

In the meantime, Greeley became increasingly dependent upon his managing editor for the efficient conduct of the paper. Politics encroached ever more extensively on his busy day. In 1866 he ran for Congress, and in 1869 for State Comptroller. He actively supported the party by speaking tours in the canvasses, and between whiles served as member of the New York County Committee. To this activity he added literary labors—his *American Conflict* and *Recollections of a Busy Life* were both completed between 1865 and 1868. Lecture tours and his beloved farm at Chappaqua consumed more of his time and energy. The routine of the *Tribune*, then, rested upon his assistants.

These were, in 1865, not altogether adequate for the demands of post-war journalism. In part, this was due to the natural metabolism of the living organism which was the *Tribune*. The men who had grown gray in the warfare against slavery had also, in many cases, made themselves independent of the daily grind of newspaper work. Bayard Taylor, like Greeley, chafed under a servitude no longer economically necessary, and contributed at longer intervals. John F. Cleveland, Greeley's brother-in-law, a serviceable and efficient news editor before the war, was now holding a Treasury position. Oliver Johnson was managing editor of the *Independent*,

partially estranged from his old friend and associate by Greeley's course in the war. Franklin J. Ottarson, city editor of the 'fifties, was past his period of service, though still in the office.

The managing editor was Sidney Howard Gay, who had succeeded Charles A. Dana in 1862. His was the most arduous post in the *Tribune*. His capacity is indicated by his conduct of the paper during the trying times from 1862 to 1865, when he was credited with holding the paper true to the Union in spite of the vacillations of his chief. But in 1865, Gay was 50, and his health was breaking. Moreover, in the opinion of one of his subordinates, Gay, a man "of soft manners and heart," lacked the "natural gift of command."⁷

Younger and more vigorous elements were present in the *Tribune* organization of 1865, especially among the war correspondents. George W. Smalley, the hero of Antietam, impatient, fond of action, somewhat brusque in manner, was on the editorial staff at the close of the war. Junius Henri Browne left the paper to do magazine work shortly after his escape from the South, but his fellow fugitive, Albert Dean Richardson, remained on the staff until his tragic death in 1869. Richardson was felt, by some of his Western associates, to be a typical New England Puritan, cold and rather precise. But his intimates in the *Tribune* office knew him as a hearty companion, and Daniel Frohman, whom Richardson selected as his messenger, declares him "the finest man I ever knew." He was certainly an able newspaperman, and one of the most promising members of the *Tribune* staff when the war ended.

But new blood was urgently needed in the paper, and the transfusion began in 1865. The Washington correspondent of the *Tribune* at the close of the war was Samuel Wilkeson. He was the son of a man prominent in promoting the colonization of the negro outside the borders of the United States—another instance of the manner in which Greeley attracted to his side the varied progeny, literal or spiritual, of the slavery controversy. Wilkeson had been on the paper's staff for twelve years and in Washington was intimate with the radical group of politicians. The correspondence from that city during his time of office reflected a strong anti-Lincoln bias, and a rather unpleasant flavor of intrigue surrounds his name. He was present with Cameron at an interview with Sherman in the early days of the war, when that translated college pres-

ident, unaware of Wilkeson's connection with the press, gave vent to a pessimistic estimate of the forces opposing him. Wilkeson gave out the story, strongly implying doubts of Sherman's sanity, which he believed unbalanced by the task confronting him. Sherman was justifiably furious at the breach of confidence.⁸

During part of the war, Wilkeson was in charge of publicity for Jay Cooke's bonds, and in 1865 he took a permanent position with the financier. Carl Schurz, less crafty, but quite as radical as Wilkeson, was persuaded that he could serve the cause best as a *Tribune* correspondent, and rather reluctantly took over Wilkeson's post for the winter of 1865-66.⁹

In the home office two important acquisitions were made by the *Tribune* in 1865. The dramatic critic at the time was Edward House, and his department was quite the orphan child of the paper. Greeley mistrusted the theater on moral grounds and as an agency which opposed his reforms. Thus, while in literature, music and art, the *Tribune* was favorably known for the comment of men like George Ripley, William Henry Fry and Clarence Cook, the paper's treatment of the drama brought little honor. In August, 1865, a young man who already bore the signs of that melancholy temperament which was to be his most emphatic personal attribute, succeeded House. His name was William Winter, and in the course of forty years of service on the paper he made it renowned for vigorous and thoroughgoing comment on the American stage.

John R. G. Hassard was probably the happiest product of Gay's last year in office. A lank-built man with sandy hair and side whiskers, he possessed real charm of style and breadth of culture. His versatility was amazing. By 1868, he was second-in-command to the managing editor, presiding during the latter's absence. He wrote graceful and humorous editorials and literary criticism. There is a tradition that, before the advent of the Sunday edition, Hassard came to the office one Sunday. It was customary, then, to make up Monday's editorial page from "standing proof"—written on Saturday. Hassard found an item in proof that displeased him and corrected it. Then, bit by bit, he proceeded to rewrite the whole editorial page—and did it well.

In 1867 Hassard became the regular music critic of the paper. His technical equipment fell below that of William H. Fry, his pred-

ecessor, but in its place he was able to bring a fresh and honest appreciation that was perhaps better suited to the relatively unsophisticated audience he addressed.

The alteration of the *Tribune's* personnel, begun in 1865, was enormously accelerated in the following year. In June, 1866, Gay retired under plea of ill health and John Russell Young took over the difficult position of managing editor. The change was startling. Young was less than half the age of his predecessor, though already well known in journalism. Born in Ireland, in 1841, the same year that witnessed the first appearance of the *Tribune*, he was a pure product of newspaper life. He began as printer's devil, served as dramatic critic and reporter, and was managing editor of the *Philadelphia Press* when barely past his majority. He followed Banks's Red River expedition as war correspondent, and was selected by the astute Jay Cooke to open an office for the sale of government bonds in New York City.

It was during this financial interlude that Young began his connection with the *Tribune*, contributing occasional editorials of a truculent incisiveness which caught the fancy of Greeley. This introduction led Young at twenty-five to the most coveted post in American journalism, and brought to the *Tribune* a personality which profoundly influenced its career. Young possessed abounding vitality and supreme self-confidence. He did not fear innovation and apparently was not unduly concerned by questions of economic expediency. With his arrival, the reign of youth set in at the old building on Nassau Street. Within a year, the most important executive posts on the paper were held by men under thirty—the managing editor was twenty-five, the city editor the same age, and the Washington Bureau in charge of a youth barely out of his 'teens!

The *Tribune* office during this youthful administration bears a close resemblance in spirit to the modern newspaper, for all the minor differences of technique and equipment. It functioned with much of the impersonal precision of its present form, even in the evening of what is known as personal journalism. Greeley's impress was on the paper, it reflected his thought and style, but the great editor had little more direct contact with his staff than does the head of one of our journals of today.

Young ran the office with almost military discipline. He consulted

his chief, of course, but the orders of the day were issued from the book-lined study of the managing editor. Here, at one o'clock every afternoon, he gathered the associate editors about him. There was John Drean Stockton, one of Young's appointees from Philadelphia, a brother of Frank R. Stockton. He dealt with political subjects mainly. Hassard received diverse assignments for his facile pen. Professor Alexander J. Schem was a specialist on foreign affairs, and Denslow, former managing editor of the *Chicago Republican*, an expert on financial matters. N. C. Meeker was Agricultural Editor, a position of importance with the *Tribune Weekly's* rural clientele. Winter, looking like "a German Turner going to a funeral,"¹⁰ and Clarence Cook, the vitriolic art critic whose biting comment is said to have provoked a committee of the much-abused to petition Greeley for his removal, made up, with George Ripley, the critical staff.

The editorial council was short and bore a closer resemblance to an oral assignment sheet than to a meeting of minds. Suggestions were in order, but in general the process consisted of a brisk allocation of topics and space. Standing proofs were overhauled and the order of their insertion arranged. An hour sufficed for the council, and the staff dispersed to take up their duties.

The city editor's department was conducted in much the same fashion. Amos J. Cummings was city editor under Young, and his subsequent career on the *Sun* is ample justification of his selection at the age of twenty-five. Cummings was typesetter and proof-reader on the *Tribune* before his elevation, with an interlude of military service. Gay brought him into the editorial department, where he developed into "the best all-round newsman of the day."¹¹ Nervous and profane, with a colorful past, he was of the romantic type of city editor which only too seldom justifies its literary prevalence by materializing at the city desk.

The local news staff of the *Tribune* consisted in those days of some thirty-odd reporters. Their field of action included the district within a radius of fifty miles. The commuter was becoming a recognized factor in the life of the city at this time (Cummings estimated that over 75,000 persons doing business in New York resided in the country)¹² and the *Tribune*, then as since, catered especially to this class. In Newark and Paterson, which had no morning press, the

Tribune endeavored to supply the want.

The difficulty of covering this territory becomes apparent when the importance of the telephone is realized. In its place the telegraph, cab and special messenger had to provide the connection between reporter and city desk—and these were not always readily available. Interoffice communications were made by means of speaking tubes, bells and a sort of dumb-waiter running from floor to floor.

The city room equipment was not luxurious nor even neat. The desks were badly battered and there were not enough to go round. Even the editors, in their ground-glass compartment off the city room, had sometimes to wait their turn before occupying a desk. The habit which Dickens found so offensive in Americans added to the slovenly appearance of the "old rookery," for it is told of George Ripley as a distinctive characteristic that he was "pleasant and sociable with those who never blow tobacco smoke in his face, or eject saliva about his desk."¹³

The overcrowding necessitated the use of part of the library as Young's office. Imagine a managing editor installed in the midst of the steady stream of earnest searchers after truth which flows through a modern newspaper library! To be sure, the primitive morgue was installed near the city desk. It consisted of a tolerably complete file of political information and a group of prepared manuscript obituaries of prominent figures, and was seldom used to fill out a story. The reporter of that day assumed a knowledge of the careers of public men on the part of his readers which would be over-flattering in a paper of the present.

The city room salaries were not exactly princely in the 'sixties. More than half of the reporters worked on space, piecework, a system which was apt to pay a good man well—for a time. But space rates were seldom permitted to exceed the wages of men on the regular establishment, which ranged from fifteen to thirty-seven dollars a week in 1868.

To earn his salary, the *Tribune* reporter had to subject himself to a rigid discipline. One of the sore spots in the New York newspaper scene was Bohemia, a *Freistadt* of indeterminate boundaries and uncertain revenues. The inhabitants were the free lances of literature, subsisting by occasional forays into journalism. City

editors mistrusted these *Lanzknechts* and hedged their standing armies of reporters about with regulations. An assignment sheet controlled their movements and strict laws governed style and choice of words. In the *Tribune*, Horace Greeley would swoop down with point and force upon any reporter who ventured to "editorialize":

I want to ascertain what reporter of a late Democratic Union Convention talked of that Convention going through the "farce" of making up a ticket. Whoever doesn't know what is a reporter's business, and that it is not that of editing the paper—ought to find some other place.¹⁴

The guardian of the *Tribune's* austere vocabulary was George Ripley. As a reporter of the early 'seventies expressed it:

The index of forbidden words was very lengthy, and his use of them, when they escaped the keen eye of a copyreader and got into print, was punishable by suspension without pay for a week, or immediate discharge. It was a rigid system, rigidly enforced.¹⁵

The collection of news without the metropolitan area was not yet as systematized as local newsgathering, but the process was already under way in Young's time. The *Tribune* received its out-of-town news from its own bureaus in Washington and London, from special correspondents sent out by the paper, occasional correspondents contributing local news from all quarters of the globe, and from the Associated Press.

The paper had maintained a correspondent in Washington for many years. Upon Young's accession to office, he placed his younger brother, James Rankin Young, a lad of nineteen, in this important post. "Jim" Young had no newspaper experience, but he retained his position for five years, two years longer than his brother.

The London bureau was an innovation. Karl Marx and Moncure D. Conway had served the *Tribune* as correspondents in England, but George W. Smalley conceived the idea of creating a central office in London which would serve as an extension of the managing director's authority. Smalley and Henry Villard had been sent to Europe in 1866 to cover the Austro-Prussian War, but the abrupt termination of that struggle occurred at Sadowa before the *Tribune* men reached the scene of action. Smalley, however, secured an im-

portant interview with Bismarck which laid the foundations for a career as the American de Blowitz.

While Smalley was gathering up the loose ends of the war's concluding phases, an important event occurred which emphasized the need for unified control of the paper's foreign service. On July 28, the Atlantic cable reached Heart's Content, Newfoundland, and this time established a permanent connection by wire between the two continents. On August 1, the *Tribune* published its first dispatch "From Our Special Correspondent in London by the Atlantic Cable." The meager report cost nearly \$200, £1 a word:

Peace was certain at Berlin on Saturday. Bismarck and the King return this week.

Prussia carries all her points. The Liberals support Bismarck's foreign policy.

Austria's naval victory is much overrated.

The Hyde Park riots and the movement to form exclusive Reform League meetings have perilled the Derby Government.

With Europe only a few hours from the *Tribune* office, some sort of a permanent European organization became desirable. On his return to this country, Smalley suggested that an editor be sent to London to act in general authority over all European correspondence.¹⁶ Young was at first rather opposed to delegating this power to a semi-independent subordinate, but he finally consented, and on May 11, 1867, the following announcement appeared in the *Tribune*:

Mr. Smalley sails for Europe today to act as Foreign Commissioner for the *Tribune*, resident in London.

The work of establishing the European Bureau included making satisfactory arrangements with the cable authorities. In the early days a regulation was in effect which materially retarded the transmission of press dispatches. All messages for the cable had to be filed at an inland telegraph office, and frequently this added hours to the time consumed. With his customary brashness, Smalley assailed the manager of the cable company and succeeded in obtaining a special dispensation from this decree for *Tribune* messages.¹⁷ This was to prove of substantial value in the race for the wires

which ensued during the Franco-Prussian War.

The *Tribune* maintained regular correspondents at several important European capitals during the first ten years after the war. As the salaries were not high (Clarence Cook, serving for a brief period as Paris correspondent, received \$1,000 a year for a weekly letter),¹⁸ these posts were usually filled by part-time journalists. The diplomatic service supplied Joseph Hance, Secretary of Legation at Berlin, and the "wayward, fascinating and brilliant," William H. Huntington at Paris. Signora Jessie White Mario, an Englishwoman whose husband was on Garibaldi's staff, was filched by the *Tribune* from the *Post*—to Bryant's great annoyance. Even the Levant was not neglected, and in a volume of the *Tribune* for 1867 in the office files, penciled credit is given to "Williams" and "Stillman" for reports from Constantinople and Syria.

The "special" and "occasional" correspondents were infinite in variety. A. D. Richardson and Bayard Taylor made trips to the west in the former capacity. "Our special correspondent 'Mark Twain'" sent back accounts of his wanderings with the "Innocents Abroad," and continued the connection through 1867. Henry George contributed a long letter on the menace of Chinese immigration in California. "Rankin" wrote important correspondence on the progress of reconstruction in the South. Some of this material was initialed, some pseudonymous and, rarely, signed in full. In bulk it was impressive, in quality, almost invariably well written and informative.

The Associated Press undoubtedly contributed much of the out-of-town news to the *Tribune's* columns—how much it is difficult to determine, since credit lines were not always employed. The Associated Press in this period consisted of seven New York papers—the *Journal of Commerce*, *Express*, *Herald*, *Sun*, *Tribune*, *World* and *Times*. These journals had full control of the organization, selling the news gathered by their joint efforts to other American papers. In 1866, the Western Associated Press, which purchased of the New York Association as a group, attempted to set up an independent service with the aid of the discharged agent of the eastern combination. The rebellion was short-lived, and a new agreement was reached. Under this treaty, the country was covered with a network of Associations; Western, North-Western, South-

ern, South-Western, New England and several state groups—all subsidiary to the New York Associated Press. By cable, the Associated Press was linked with the great European services, Reuter, Havas and Wolff, and for all practical purposes the world lay before the *Tribune* reader of the late 'sixties almost as completely as it does today. The broad outlines of modern newsgathering had been sketched in, only color and details remained in the future.¹⁹

The mighty grist of news harvested over a world was received in the Associated Press office at Liberty Street and Broadway. It was almost painfully condensed—about 35,000 words a day being the normal amount. This was transcribed in manifold and distributed to the twelve papers in the metropolitan area subscribing to the service, as well as to the representatives of the auxiliary association. The cost to the *Tribune* varied from \$14,000 a year to nearly \$500 a week.

The whole mass of news—telegraph, cable and letter, special correspondence and city news—went through the hands of the news editor, Dr. Woods, to the composing room. This was the realm of Thomas Rooker, a man of substance and authority. A veteran of the *Tribune's* first days, he was also one of the original stockholders of the paper. He was in control of all the *Tribune's* presswork, and he cherished the charge, proud of the paper's reputation for neatness of typography and efficiency in publication.

The type was all set by hand, of course, and it required five or six hours to make up the paper under normal conditions. There were over fifty compositors employed, all paid by the piece—56¢ per 1,000 ems. At these rates, the typographers could earn \$20 to \$30 a week, or nearly as much as a good reporter. The work was grueling, however, since the men were required to be on the job for nearly ten hours a day, mostly under gaslight in an ill-ventilated room, where in summer the temperature once reached 113°.

The compositors were divided into "phalanxes"—a title that recalls Greeley's flirtation with Fourierism. As the work began to drop off, at midnight or later, phalanx after phalanx was dismissed, until the "correcting phalanx" alone remained. The latter group received the last proof, corrected the errors, and the paper was in type.

The completed forms went from the composing room to the

stereotypers. These valuable assistants were the result of Tom Rooker's fatherly concern for his paper (he really owned one-twentieth, almost as much as Greeley at the end) and only dated back to 1860. Rooker experimented with stereotypes, but unsuccessfully. The *London Times* secured a process, but the inventors wanted \$30,000 a year to supply the *Tribune*. Finally, a New Yorker, Charles Craske, developed a method of preparing papier-mâché, which, beaten on the type with a hair brush, received a clear impression. This paper mold was in turn used to cast a metal plate. In this manner the *Tribune* type was saved the expensive and wearing work of actually printing the paper, and more than one plate could be used for the same page, thus speeding the work of the presses.²⁰

The great cylinder presses of the paper were down in a vaultlike cellar. Here the plates were fastened to the cylinders and ground out news, editorials and advertisements to the puffing admonition of a near-by steam engine. The papers were no longer folded by hand; a folding machine performed that task.

The distribution of the damp sheets that rolled from under the presses was the concern of the counting room on the main floor. Here was centered all that pertained to the *Tribune* as a commercial proposition, under the supervision of Samuel Sinclair, the publisher. Sinclair began as a nine-dollar-a-week clerk in the office during Thomas McElrath's regime. He advanced to the position of cashier, acquired stock and eventually succeeded to the position of publisher on McElrath's retirement. As far as can be determined, he did not succeed to the trust and affection in which Greeley held McElrath; he was a hard man, proud and unsympathetic, heartily disliked by the staff. On the other hand there is no evidence of any real friction. The publisher's office in the *Tribune* was sharply limited, by the by-laws of the Association, and in all probability Sinclair did not exert pressure, which his position as largest stockholder permitted, to traverse the bounds of his technical authority.

The publisher's department, including the advertising, circulation, promotion and accounting side of the paper, had one of the smallest staffs housed in the *Tribune* building. A score of clerks performed the functions which now absorb the greater proportion of any newspaper personnel. Most of the chiefs were older men;

the sweeping rejuvenation which transformed the editorial staff left the counting room untouched. Moreover, Sinclair was not really efficient. He permitted correspondence to pile up on his desk and held aloof from the routine of the department.

As a result, promotional and advertising methods were rather primitive. To expand the circulation of the paper, the business staff resorted to such simple expedients as direct advertising, particularly in political campaigns, and offered premiums to subscribers. It is a curious commentary on the personal appeal of Horace Greeley that one of these premiums was a steel engraving of his cherubic countenance.

The advertiser had, as a rule, to be content with an unsubtle insertion of his paid announcement. The complex tie-up between advertising and theatrical and fashion news, to mention only two subjects wherein news values and advertising are profitably mingled at the present, was practically nonexistent. The use of the news columns for advertising was not unknown, of course. Railroads, mines and real estate were frequently promoted in this fashion. But this type of indirect advertising had not been defined or systematized, and was much more open to abuse.

The financial position of the *Tribune* was not very encouraging during Young's expensive career. In 1865, the price of print paper, which had been the principal factor in the poor returns of 1864, dropped from 27¢ to 12.6¢ a pound. In that year the *Tribune* cleared \$170,429.86, a very tidy sum. In the following year, the price rose again to 17.2¢, and the page size was increased. In consequence the paper bill was over \$100,000 higher in 1867, and the profits dropped to \$24,259.50. The page size had been increased before Young's accession to office, but other items may be charged to his account—telegraph expenses were more than doubled, editorial charges were increased by \$30,000; in a word, the establishment that Gay conducted for \$646,107.16 in 1865, cost \$885,158.39 under Young in 1866.²¹ The price of paper gradually receded after 1866 and the financial health of the paper took on a slight turn for the better, but in 1868, the last full year of Young's reign, the best that Greeley could say was "I believe it will pay, even in 1868, and thereafter."²² Reconstruction in the *Tribune* was expensive.

The object of all this complex activity and concern was an eight-

page paper, with six columns to each page. Unimpressive in size, by modern standards, it was most sedate in appearance. The New York business man in Andrew Johnson's administration did not read as he ran; he digested a solid ration of news along with an ample and leisurely breakfast.

The masthead bore the title *NEW-YORK TRIBUNE*, in Old English, flanking the allegorical device which the paper bears to-day. This device was adopted on April 10, 1866, the *Tribune's* twenty-fifth birthday, superseding a cut of a printing press. The masthead remained unchanged until the purchase of the *Herald*, almost sixty years later, save for the hyphen, which disappeared in 1914.

During the war and for a few years thereafter, the headlines frequently took up from a third to a quarter of the front page columns. The type was seldom larger than one-half inch in height and never spread over more than one column in width, but depth was attained by the use of numerous crossheads in diverse type faces. These were intended to stimulate interest rather than tell a story, as the following example shows:

VIRGINIA!

Our Armies Again Victorious.

General Sheridan Fights a Battle near Burkesville.
He Captures Six Generals, Several Thousand Prisoners
and 14 Cannon.

Prospects of Lee's Surrender.

Reports of Gen's. Meade, Humphreys, and Wright.
Successful Movements of the Different Corps.

Rapid Marching of the Union Forces.

The Occupation of Richmond.

Account By Our Special Correspondent.

Events of outstanding importance, such as the fall of Richmond, were signaled by a cut of a triumphant eagle, but that was the extent of typographical enthusiasm. In the post-war years the make-up became more austere, and simple non-descriptive heads became the fashion—"Europe," "Washington," "Reconstruction," and the like. A gory story of the slaughter of some settlers and the subsequent gutting of an Indian village appeared under the chaste heading "The Indians," and in reporting Lincoln's assassination,

news of which reached New York almost too late for the paper, some inspired editor achieved a miracle of understatement. The headline was "Highly Important," and it appeared on the fourth page.

For rare occasions of national mourning, the *Tribune*, in common with other papers, resorted to the device of inverting the column rules. These were strips of lead separating the columns of type, which in their normal position took no ink. Reversed, the rules printed a wide black stripe between each two columns and the paper took on a very lugubrious aspect indeed.

The body of the *Tribune* was neat, but the use of small, close-set type made a dark page. The type was clear and distinct against the white rag paper and the proof reading was painstaking. Nowadays, with five editions, each larger than the old *Tribune's* whole daily circulation, and each containing four or five times as many pages, the amount of error in newspaper typography is considerable. But even in the past, some mistakes crept in, to Greeley's wrath and occasional embarrassment, as the following apology attests:

Erratum.—A typographical error of some importance occurred in the Jersey City ferry article over the signature of F. in yesterday's *Tribune*; the word *pirate* should read *private* Corporations.

In general, the style of the *Tribune's* writers matched the trim severity of its physical appearance. Compression was the dominant note; it was necessary, in order to cover the wide field of news opened by telegraph and cable, without expensive increase in paper bills. The reporter who cultivated a barren two-line fact into a column of flowery verbiage had short shrift. He was in dubious standing in the profession, then; dubbed "Jenkins" and severely rebuked by competitors.

Jenkins was especially unpopular in the *Tribune*. That paper inclined to what John Hay called the "Grocer's Bill" style—"Facts; facts; nothing but facts. So many peas at so much a peck; so much molasses at so much a quart."²³ It was the ideal vehicle for the hard-headed.

Lest this give the impression that the *Tribune* was over-baldly explicit, it should be noted that the shackles of the Grocer's Bill

were imposed only upon reporters. Correspondents had full latitude for fine writing, and the editorial page was a revelation in eloquence and humor. William H. Huntington in Paris wrote after the discursive style of French journalism; beginning one of his delightful letters, "The sky is dull, the weather drizzly, the streets dirty. Go to, let this letter be doleful . . ." and ending with a monody on the illness of Theresa—"Theresa, the great singing woman, alto in voice, broad in song, broadissimo in illustrative gesture."

Fashion, too, demanded a lighter touch than the strict canons of *Tribune* reportorial style permitted. The feminine note was even then in evidence. Mrs. Calhoun, later wife of Cornelius A. Runkle, counsel for the *Tribune* Association, was a valuable contributor. We are told that she wrote a "brilliant series of articles on 'Cooking' treated from an artistic standpoint," and further that her "descriptions of the Arion and Liederkrantz carnivals attracted great attention." Miss Dunning wrote fashion reports, all about "handsome gimps," simple vandyked squares and similar mysteries, prefaced by idyllic passages in which the writer goes

Lounging down Broadway 'neath the warm golden slants of a mild March day's grateful sunshine . . .

The news which was served in these various manners was roughly proportioned, in an average eight-page *Tribune*, at the rate of 8 columns of telegraphic, cable and mail news, 5 of editorials, 2 of criticism, 4 of commercial and shipping news and 2 of weather reports, sports and miscellaneous bits. Incidentally, the weather reports were compiled by the *Tribune's* own "bureau," a learned gentleman who roosted on top of a nine-story building, renting telescopes before St. Paul's between observations.

The remaining half of the paper was given up to advertisements, patent medicines predominating. When their pressure on the news columns became too severe, the *Tribune* was issued with a Supplement of four pages, making a "Triple Sheet" of twelve pages. The advertisements were usually set in type no larger than that of the news columns and space was occupied by learned disquisitions on the properties of the product, endless repetitions of the name, or patterns in type.

Such was the *Tribune* in its physical attributes, during the first

few years following the war. Essentially it was not greatly changed from the newspaper of pre-war days in appearance, though Greeley's attempts to meet altered conditions in journalism, and, possibly, to gratify his own desire for freedom, had altered the personnel considerably.

The most obvious effects of the new regime appeared in its approach to national problems, in its effort to adapt the paper's editorial policy to the many questions which Reconstruction evoked, and to find a successor for the cause just won.

CHAPTER III

THE HOUSE AFIRE

THE situation which the nation faced in 1865 was one which called for the highest statesmanship on the part of the leaders of American opinion. After any war, the work of internal reorganization is a task of difficulty and danger. The reabsorption of armies into their peacetime pursuits, the adjustment of dislocated industry, the payment of an enormously increased national debt and the reorganization of temporary fiscal arrangements demand the utmost administrative skill and public coöperation. When, as at the close of the Civil War, these pressing problems are vitally bound up with the delicate question of relations between victor and vanquished, the work of rehabilitation is appalling in its complexity.

At the outset, one great problem absorbed the interest of the public. The immediate need was to restore the solidarity of what *Punch* was fond of terming the Dis-united States.

In performing this task, it is now generally conceded that the dominant faction of the North, the "Radicals," committed fatal errors. As Lyman Abbott, one of their number, admits in his *Reminiscences*:

It is easy, looking back, to see that the men of that generation blundered egregiously, and brought upon the country, especially the South, and most of all upon the negro race, tragic disaster by their blundering.¹

This recognition of error has worked harm to the memory of many earnest, if not particularly far-sighted men, and none have suffered more in the process than Horace Greeley. It is customary to lump him with the Wades, the Stevenses and the Butlers, forgetting that Andrew Johnson, not especially noted for moderation of language toward his opponents, found no harsher appellation for Greeley than that of a "sublime old child";² while Stevens was addicted to poking caustic fun at his supposed ally. As a

matter of fact, Greeley and the *Tribune* do not fit into any easy generalization during the contested period of the Tragic Era; their policy, as expressed in the slogan Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage, placed them in a position midway between those who wished to restore the South with "the Rebels uppermost, the Blacks underfoot or nowhere," and those who would "confiscate, disfranchise or banish" the Southern whites.

This middle-of-the-road position was attained by a process of development. The North at the end of the war was in a state of complex disunity on the subject of Reconstruction. There was no one policy which could be truly said to represent the national will. The valuable dogma which Wilson in vain tried to establish in the World War, "in time of war, prepare for peace," suffered a similar fate in 1865, and for much the same reasons.

Lincoln formulated a policy of reëstablishing the Union in a proclamation of December of 1863. Amnesty was proffered to all Southerners in rebellion, except certain of the leaders, upon taking an oath of allegiance and accepting the decision of the North against slavery. When the number of those so submitting in any state reached 10% of the vote in 1860, this nucleus might form a government which Lincoln would recognize.

The President's action was based on the theory that the acts of secession were null and void, that the states had a continuing existence, and that the executive, by virtue of his pardoning power, might invest former rebels with the privilege of participation in their government. Opposed to this theory was a large group in Congress. Their motives were diverse—mistrust of the Southerners, desire for vengeance or justice, the wish to protect the freed blacks, personal dislike of Lincoln and jealousy of the increase of executive power during the war; all these factors were probably present.

At the head of the Congressional revolt against Lincoln were "bluff Ben" Wade and Henry Winter Davis. Under the auspices of the latter, a bill was presented to Congress which substituted for Lincoln's plan a reduction of the seceded states to territorial status, under the supervision and control of Congress. That is, a provisional governor was to be appointed in the conquered states, and the accession of a *majority* of the citizens of these states was

necessary to secure readmission to the Union—and then only after new constitutions were drawn up embodying the disfranchisement of certain classes of rebels, the extinction of slavery and the repudiation of the Confederate debt. And Congress was to determine when these conditions had been complied with.

Thus, by 1864, the lines were drawn between two plans of reconstruction, that of the President and that of Congress. The *Tribune* from the first sided with Lincoln, although Greeley's party affiliations and his distrust of Lincoln's executive capacity drew him to the Congressional camp. The paper had only the highest praise for the President's proclamation. It deprived the Southern leaders of the excuse that Northern victory would be followed by confiscation and the loss of civil rights. The "master spirits" might not be conciliated "but to what end shall the non-slave-holding conscripts remain and fight? . . . We proffer them equality with ourselves. Should not that suffice and content them?"

Thanks, then, to our President for the wise humanity and generous impulses which prompted the issue of his Proclamation of Amnesty! It must be that in this sign we shall conquer!

As the war drew to a close, the *Tribune* became insistent that the policy of Lincoln be embodied in general terms to the whole of the South. There was a tendency on the part of the Radicals to imply that the Proclamation of 1863 was an experiment, that it applied only to Louisiana and that the remaining states would be dealt with on a different basis. Even Lincoln, in his last speech on April 11, 1865, said that in view of the "great peculiarities" pertaining to each state, "no exclusive and inflexible plan can safely be prescribed in details and collaterals." Therefore Greeley urged that the spirit of the earlier declaration be reasserted in unmistakable fashion. In February 23, 1865, an editorial favored clothing Lincoln with complete powers to make peace:

If it were put to a general vote—"Will you uphold and prosecute the War till Abraham Lincoln says its end on your part has been attained, and then agree to such terms of pacification as he shall prescribe or accede to"—we are confident that the yeas would have a very large majority.

Such a move, in the *Tribune's* opinion, would contribute toward a speedy ending of the war and permit the Southerners to resume their place in the Union with a minimum of bitterness:

Let them but feel that they are to be received with kindness, and they will make haste to cast away the weapons of fratricidal war and return to the bosom of their country. If their offense has been grievous, it must be felt that, as a class, grievously have they answered. The nation needs peace, not vengeance; it demands return to heartfelt loyalty, not useless slaughter.

This was both humane and politic. On March 13, 1865, Jefferson Davis again endeavored to whip up the jaded spirit of the Southerners with the threat that a conquering North would grant them nothing but bare "permission to live in a country garrisoned by their own negroes and governed by officers sent by the conquerors to work over them."³ Yet the "practical" men of the North insisted to the last that a general offer of amnesty would but stiffen the Confederate resistance.

When this argument lost its validity at Appomattox, the Northern cry of expediency changed to that of justice. The world has seen the like after every war, and it is a matter of surprise that it was not more vehement in 1865. The North had been taught that the white man south of the Mason and Dixon line was a slave driver and a dram drinker, of violent passions and bitter pride. It was, when war broke out, ready to believe stories of Southern atrocity and to put the worst construction on acts of military necessity. The policy of the North, in refusing the exchange of prisoners, saddled the starving South with thousands of unwelcome guests, and the "horrors of Andersonville" resulted. The massacre of Fort Pillow, the "piracies" of the Confederate cruisers and privateers were crimes to Northern eyes, and weird tales of the murder of wounded men, the desecration of the dead and the "manufacture of rings and drinking cups out of the bones and skulls of Union soldiers after the battle of Bull Run"⁴ found ready credence. The Southerners were traitors and mutineers, in the harsh logic of revolutions, and some must die. It was not so long since the British had shot Sepoys from the mouths of cannon.

To Greeley, with his horror of bloodshed, the demand of the

Unionists for the trial and execution of the leaders of the South was a cause of deep grief. In private he wrote:

And our folks, having got everything, are ravenous for more. Peace, Union and Liberty seem to them of no value if we cannot have a little hanging for sauce. . . . I want to close the strife so soon as may be, and secure the fruits of our victory.⁵

This sentiment found public utterance in one of Greeley's most moving editorials, wherein he argued for the most complete "magnanimity in triumph." "Wholesale confiscation and cruel rigor" would, he warned, lead to a dangerous guerrilla warfare. Even the execution of the chiefs would be impolitic. "A single Confederate led out to execution would be evermore enshrined in a million hearts as a conspicuous hero and martyr."

We plead against passions certain at this moment to be fierce and intolerant; but on our side are the Ages and voice of History. We plead for a restoration of the Union against a policy which would afford a momentary gratification at the cost of years of perilous hate and bitterness.

Such extensive charity was not fashionable. Each of the *Tribune's* gestures of amity in those days cost "thousands of subscribers." Even within the paper there was rebellion. A. D. Richardson, smarting at the sight of Roger A. Pryor wandering foot-loose and fêted while "15,000 loyal men are still in Southern prisons," addressed a letter of protest to President Lincoln which was no less a protest against his chief's doctrine of leniency. While deprecating "bitterness" and "general severity," Richardson felt that

. . . a few leading traitors ought to be tried, convicted and executed to vindicate outraged Law and for an eternal warning that Treason is Crime. It is idle to ask which traitors should be selected. Select from all who can be secured, those who are the best or the nearest representative men.

The paper's contemporaries were also inclined toward a "little hanging for sauce" and severely rebuked Greeley's "shallow philanthropism." The *Times*, notwithstanding the fact that it had argued for reasonable treatment for the mass of the Southerners,

to the extent of urging that the approaching ceremonies in recaptured Fort Sumter be conducted with due respect for the sensibilities of the vanquished, expressed an earnest desire for the blood of Jefferson Davis. "If the *Tribune* will pardon us," said Raymond's editorial page, ". . . the hanging of Jeff Davis is called for to correct just such lax notions of governmental authority as the *Tribune* itself sometimes inculcates."

Greeley was hardened to the squibs of his competitors. He continued his pleas for mercy, and on April 14 bade the President say, in terms suggesting the slogan of 1872, "Slavery having, through Rebellion, committed suicide, let the North and the South unite to bury its carcase, and then clasp hands across the grave."

But suddenly the grave yawned. Late on the following evening, as the stereotypers' brushes were padding against the type of the *Tribune's* front pages, a bit of paper came from the Associated Press office with a message of startling and tragic import. It was followed by a wire from Wilkeson to "stop" the dispatch. A short interval of uncertainty, and then stark confirmation. President Lincoln was fatally shot, and Secretary Seward stabbed. The editorial page was hastily dismantled and, as bulletin after bulletin arrived, each was inserted. They all, though often contradictory, pointed to one dismal conclusion: "We go to press without knowing the exact truth, but we presume there is not the slightest ground for hope." At 4:30 A. M., a "Postscript" was added to the last page—the President was "Just Alive At 3 A.M." Before the average New Yorker read the news, the end had come.

The following day was the Sabbath. The *Tribune* did not issue a Sunday edition, but other papers did and the pulpit became a resounding organ of public opinion. By the time the next *Tribune* appeared, the wrath of the people had received ample expression. Privately Greeley was appalled at the "storm of ferocity" which the murder had aroused. The people seemed "thoroughly demoralized,"⁶ and the chance of the South to receive fair and merciful treatment had apparently gone forever. This personal conviction of its editor infused the gloomy leader with which the *Tribune* greeted the morning of April 17.

We have labored long and earnestly to produce a feeling favorable to conciliation and kindness toward the defeated Rebels, which a mis-

creant's murderous hand has in one moment overthrown. We have not hesitated to brave misapprehension and alienation, if we so might restore peace and amity to this stricken land; and now all is lost but the good intention which is never entirely fruitless. We know nothing, say nothing of President Johnson's purposes; but in the present state of public feeling, he could not do with safety what President Lincoln might easily have done a little week ago.

.

And, though the military power of the Rebellion is broken, its spirit is untamed; and that spirit, still burning in many bosoms, will have been intensified and embittered by the tragedy of Friday night and the consuming wrath which that tragedy has excited throughout the Loyal States. The rebellion may be, will be, must be suppressed; its visible tangible presence will soon have ceased to scourge our country; but the genuine Peace which we had hoped to see established has faded like a vision. We have before us the slow and difficult task of treading out the embers of a dying but desperate Rebellion.

The dismal foreboding evidenced by this editorial failed to prevent Greeley from continuing his efforts to secure a rational and merciful treatment of the South, but the brutal assassination of the man who most nearly embodied the *Tribune's* policy in public life gave a new impetus to those who demanded sterner measures. The Radicals were frankly pleased at the removal of an obstacle to their plans. Samuel Wilkeson was in close touch with the leaders of this faction, and on the afternoon of Lincoln's death he attended a caucus at which Wade, Zachariah Chandler and George W. Julian made no secret of their relief at the war President's passing. Wilkeson volunteered to "put Greeley on the war-path,"⁷ and his influence as the *Tribune's* interpreter of Washington affairs may well have been considerable.

The events of the summer and fall of 1865 were to have a decisive effect on the *Tribune's* policy toward the South. Greeley, as has been shown, opposed any punitive measures against any of the vanquished. At first he believed that, in the exercise of their franchise under the Lincoln plan of reconstruction, the Southerners would repudiate their old leaders, clinging to the belief that the acts of secession and the long fight to make them valid by force of arms was the work of an active minority. But, by May 27, he reached the conclusion that the natural strength of the South, in or out of the Union, lay in that very group which had always

represented the slave states in government, and to them he appealed:

It is already evident that what styles itself "the Union party" of the South is utterly inadequate to the work of reconstruction. Its doings in Louisiana, in Missouri, in Tennessee have established this beyond question. It tends on the one hand to protract and inflame feuds that ought so soon as possible to be buried in oblivion, and on the other to perpetuate disabilities which inexorable events have rendered absurd. Palpably, this Union party lacks at once faith, strength and courage. Not daring to enfranchise the Blacks it seeks to govern by permanently disfranchising a large proportion of the whites. Such a party can give neither support to a Government nor duration to its own accidental ascendancy.

We appeal, therefore, to the gentlemen of the South—her educated, intelligent property-holders, accustomed to business and familiar with public affairs—to step forward, without regard to past differences, and lead their fellow-citizens in the work of restoring their several States to their former consideration, security and power.

The question of the status of the negro was treated with delicacy and restraint in the same editorial. Greeley was at this time ready to place the utmost confidence in the ex-Confederates:

If the Southern States will but say to their black inhabitants, "Qualify yourselves, by intelligence and thrift to vote wisely and safely; nothing more shall be needed to give you access to the ballot box," they will do all that can fairly be asked.

Surely this was sound doctrine, conservative and wise. It embodied all that the South could wish, with but slight concession to the Northern interest in the fate of the negro. It was the essence of Lincoln's policy, of Johnson's. Where was Greeley the Radical, Greeley whose editorials are so glibly quoted to instance the folly of Republican dictatorship of the South? The clue to the mystery lies in the peroration of the editorial just quoted. After warning the Southern whites that they should anticipate possible Congressional action by some substantial gesture toward the negro, Greeley ended on a minatory note:

We can neither permit our faithful, efficient coworkers in the late struggle to be directly enslaved nor so oppressed and degraded that they will regret their deliverance from legal bondage.

The word now lay with the South. Congress would not meet until December, and two days after the above editorial appeared, President Johnson issued a proclamation of amnesty which in most essentials repeated that of Lincoln. Only one significant and rather ridiculous stipulation provided that all voluntary participants in rebellion possessing more than \$20,000 in taxable property were excluded from the benefits of the amnesty. However, by individual pardons, many in the excepted classes were restored to the body politic, and it may fairly be said that the South was in a position to work out its own destiny in that fateful last half of 1865.

In this time of testing, Greeley's confidence in the efficacy of the measures of Reconstruction he had sponsored was gravely shaken. The editor was personally unfamiliar with the country south of the Mason and Dixon line. He was unable to appreciate the feelings of the Southern whites, deprived of a system of labor on which their economic structure had been reared, and suddenly confronted by an actuality they had visioned in troubled dreams—a huge, uneducated semibarbarous population freed from the extraordinary restraints of hereditary bondage. To Greeley, the negro was a child of oppression; to the South he was an economic problem and a potential social menace.

Wise and charitable interpreters might have clarified Greeley's viewpoint, since he was evidently predisposed to regard the South with sympathy. Unfortunately, in this troublous time he was dependent for information on a set of correspondents neither charitable nor overly wise; and the picture they painted of the efforts of their late enemies to meet the new conditions must have been a shock to the emotional editor. Many of the *Tribune's* correspondents reveal simple prejudice, others were unduly impressed by those disorders which are the inevitable concomitants of a society harassed by war and deprived of its accustomed economic basis.

"Jatros," writing from Galveston, felt that there was no "real loyalty" under the "loud professions" of the populace of that Texas city, and he was inclined to see real significance in a bit of doggerel scrawled on a barrack wall:

- Dear Yankee Brethering: We yield to military necessity—but remember,

"He who fights and runs away
May live to fight another day."

"Walter," at Savannah, drew a dismal sketch of the wake of destruction left by Sherman's army:

The railroads are destroyed in all this section of the country, and it will be months before they are put in running order, while the highways are almost impassable. The people seem to be utterly paralyzed and are not doing much to improve their pitiable condition.

Yet "Walter" was enormously exercised over the speed with which released rebel prisoners were being repossessed in their property.

From Norfolk, Virginia, came reports of riots and the killing of freedmen and Union whites; "Manlius" wrote from Jackson, Mississippi, that "scarcely a day passes that I do not hear of some negro murdered by a white man." Official pronouncements seemed to bear out these distressing reports, as when General Hatch, in South Carolina, issued an order forbidding "peonage," which he asserted was becoming increasingly prevalent.

Under the influence of such evidence, Greeley and the *Tribune* moved a step to the left. On July 10, the doctrine under which the editor and his paper conducted the remainder of their campaign for the reconstruction of the Union was formulated. The evil, as Greeley saw it, was that many of the whites were under "disabilities and penalties," while the blacks had no voice in their own government. Admission of both classes to the ballot box, without reserve, would provide each with a legal weapon of defence, since "a voting citizen is not often oppressed." Hence the need of Northern supervision and coercion would be removed and the South could function through constitutional channels. This idealistic program, anathema to both sections, was expressed in an appeal "To Conservatives North And South," urging the immediate adoption of "Universal Amnesty and Universal Suffrage."

This phrase, with a slight change of verbiage, became the slogan of the *Tribune*. It involved many apparent inconsistencies which seem to have troubled recent commentators, but on the whole Greeley and his paper obeyed its implications. It is, perhaps, natural that the more immediate concern of the *Tribune* was for the negro; it is regrettable but also rather natural that this

concern led the paper to support the Radicals in their policy of coercion. If both parts of Greeley's two-headed panacea could not be secured, one would normally expect to find the champion of abolition subordinating the interests of former slaveholders to those of their late bondsmen.

The situation soon made it necessary to take sides. The action of the several states under the Presidential plan of Reconstruction seemed to fulfill the evil omen of the unofficial attitude of July, as reported to the *Tribune* by its correspondents. Read in connection with stories of murder and oppression, the "black codes" passed by Southern legislatures took on a sinister significance which is lost today. The *Tribune* began to drift into the attitude that the plan of Lincoln and his successor was inadequate to secure the protection of the freedmen. Certainly the legislatures constituted under that plan showed no signs of according the negro complete suffrage—even the gestures toward that end which Lincoln, Johnson and Greeley had advocated, were ignored. South Carolina and Mississippi failed to repudiate the Confederate debt, and the latter state refused to ratify the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing slavery, or to permit negroes to own or lease land. The rights of the blacks to testify in court or to serve on juries were seriously curtailed, while vagrancy and apprenticeship laws seemed to a suspicious North to indicate that the South was determined to evade the decision of the war, an impression which the sullen speeches of certain "unreconstructed" Confederates tended to confirm.

On October 3, the *Tribune*, commenting on the refusal of Alabama to admit negro testimony, foreshadowed the efforts of Congressional Radicals to substitute a policy of coercion for the liberal program which Johnson had inherited from Lincoln:

Abolish the (Freedman's) Bureau, withdraw the United States troops—as seems to be the present policy at Washington—open the doors of Congress to the Alabama delegation, is to remit the negro to such an unchecked despotism as this ordinance imposes on him, and to announce our acquiescence in a policy that will not stop short of the extermination of the black race.

The experiment of Southern self-government had been briefly tried, with results unsatisfactory to the *Tribune*. Meanwhile, those

whose opposition to the plan dated from its initial promulgation under Lincoln were prepared to force the issue when Congress should meet in December. The situation was tense with the possibility of a clash between Johnson and his legislature. The President had proved a disappointment to the Radicals; the man who had loudly proclaimed that treason is odious and must be punished, the man of whom the *Tribune* had said, "If any Rebel ever thought it would be well for his clan to have Andrew Johnson in the White House rather than Abraham Lincoln, he is bitterly mistaken," that man was now following closely in his predecessor's tracks, earning the approbation of conservative Republican and Democrat alike. And a sound as of skinners sharpening their knives came from the tents of the Radicals.

Greeley earnestly desired to avert the threatened conflict. The *Tribune* treated the President with courtesy and consideration during the opening passes of the engagement. His message to Congress, reviewing his course, reasserting the doctrine of the permanent nature of the states and protesting against military control of the South, was warmly extolled by the paper. Doubting whether "any former message has, on the whole, contained so much that will be generally and justly approved, with so little that will or should provoke dissent," the *Tribune* went on to refer to the message as a "state paper of signal ability and unusual frankness, dealing unreservedly with every great question of internal policy and calculated to increase the hold of its author on the regard and confidence of the American people." On only one point did the paper express an objection; Johnson's contention that he was unable by fiat to force negro suffrage upon the Southern states was met by the argument that this power was similar to that of appointing provisional governors in those states.

To still, if he could, the rising storm, Greeley went to Washington, as the opposing forces dressed their ranks in that December. "I desire and labor for peace—" he wrote, "peace between our country and all others; peace between North and South; peace between white and black." Especially did he work for peace between President and Congress, since on the harmony of the two branches of government depended much of the success of Reconstruction. But the efforts of the *Tribune* and its guiding personal-

ity were unequal to the task of achieving this consummation, so devoutly to be wished, and the paper was soon drawn into opposition to the President.

Congress threw down the gage of battle at the outset. The representatives of the states lately in rebellion were denied admission to the Capitol, a pronouncement on the part of the Radicals that they considered the Lincoln plan a failure. The *Tribune* justified their action on the ground that it was necessary for the preservation of the political and civil rights of the negro and hence of the state—"Salus populi suprema lex."

Johnson accepted the challenge with a counterstroke. A bill was prepared extending the life and powers of the Freedman's Bureau, "the Nation's right arm, gently but firmly outstretched to keep the peace between these warring classes." Rumor had it that Johnson intended a veto. Said the *Tribune*:

If this purpose shall prove to be based on the assumption that Equal Rights and Equal Laws afford the true and only adequate remedy for the evils which the Freedman's Bureau attempts to mitigate, we shall heartily approve the veto, if veto there shall be. If, on the other hand, the Freedman's Bureau bill be vetoed and the Blacks remitted absolutely to the tender mercies of the late rebels now dominant in most of the Southern states, we shall receive such veto with profound regret; and so, we cannot doubt, will the more humane and considerate half of the American people.

The veto came; but it was not based on the motives which the *Tribune* hoped for. The paper had also been disappointed in the response of the President to a delegation of negroes who came to him to plead for the extension of the suffrage. The *Tribune* conceded that there was justice in Johnson's contention that the granting of this request would increase racial hate and violence. These were, said an editorial, "ugly, hateful facts, . . . but not therefore to be disregarded." But the President had offered no hope of the ballot, even in the future. He had not said, "We have abolished Slavery—be content with that for the present, and we will take another step forward just so soon as we can"; he had referred the negro to the states whose decision had been so manifest in the recent conventions and legislatures.

So the *Tribune* was brought into opposition with Andrew John-

son. On February 21, 1866, commenting dolefully on the veto of the Freedman's Bureau and the President's evident intention of meting out the same treatment to the Civil Rights Bill, an editorial expressed the reluctant conviction that ". . . it looks as though the President had made up his mind to go the whole hog with those who predict that the Blacks cannot live among us except as slaves, and who are striving to make good their prediction."

Thus war was declared, and during the year of 1866 it flamed to remarkable bitterness. A large part in the heightened tone of the *Tribune's* editorials may be ascribed to the influence of John Russell Young, whose pen was trenchant and unsubtle and whose ambition led him to utilize the frequent absences of Greeley to make his own mark on the paper's policies. Young served to intensify a conflict which was serious enough, and which was fought without quarter on either side. By August, the pitch of hatred and suspicion had reached such a point that the *Tribune* unhesitatingly accused the President of the United States of complicity in the brutal riots at New Orleans.

As the fight between the two Northern theories of reconstruction steadily widened the breach between victor and vanquished, Greeley held true to his conception of the proper method of bridging the gap. His doctrine involved political disappointment for himself and some measure of danger to his paper, yet he persisted. In 1866, the Radicals carried New York State, and he was regarded as a likely candidate for the National Senate. He was implored to keep silent on the issues of the day and permit his friends to work unhampered in the legislature. This was not to Greeley's taste, although, had he been the avid office seeker he has often been pictured, silence would have been easy. Instead, Greeley employed the occasion of his departure for a Western tour to restate at great length and over his own signature in the *Tribune*, his ideas on the "True Bases of Reconstruction"—Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage. In this essay he adverted particularly to the case of Jefferson Davis, in jail under indictment for treason since his capture on May 10, 1865. To try Davis now, would, said Greeley, "result in far more evil than good."

It would rekindle passions that have nearly burned out or been hushed to sleep; it would fearfully convulse and agitate the South; it would arrest the progress of conciliation and kindly feeling there; it would cost a large sum directly and a far larger indirectly; and unless the jury were scandalously packed—it would result in a non-agreement or no verdict.

As to suffrage for the negro, Greeley asserted that it would not have been necessary had not the "black codes" indicated that the late Confederates could not be trusted with the welfare of the freedmen. Under the circumstances, impartial suffrage would be better for the South than coercion by Congress; and an agreement of the two sections might be reached on that basis. But equal suffrage must be guaranteed by the Constitution in order to leave "no loop to hang a doubt upon." On the effects of negro voting, Greeley had "not enquired" and did not "care to know." He recognized the possibility of mistakes by the newly enfranchised, but said, "I do not concur with the careful mother who insisted that her son must be kept out of the water till he should have learned to swim." He acknowledged the necessity of some restriction on the privilege of the ballot: "lunatics, idiots, criminals, vagrants and public paupers" should be excluded, "whatever their color," and a moderate poll tax would be justifiable. An "intelligence" test would be inequitable at present, thought Greeley, since the education of the blacks had been so little furthered by their masters. Make such a regulation operative a decade hence, said he, but "do not put out a man's eyes and punish him for blindness."

But let North and South strike hands on the basis of Universal Amnesty with Impartial Suffrage, and the resulting peace will be perfect, all-embracing and enduring.

The result of this complete and gratuitous statement of principles was the defeat of Greeley's candidacy in the New York legislature. The Radicals could not stomach his assertion that he was "for universal amnesty, so far as immunity from fear of punishment or confiscation is concerned, even though impartial suffrage should, for the present, be defeated." William Pitt Fessenden attacked him in the Union League Club, while its members shouted

approval. Yet the editor was content. "Isn't it better than an election," he wrote to a friend, "to hear it said that I *might* have been chosen if I had not thrown my chance away?"⁸

Within six months of this episode, Greeley gave another proof of his devotion to the principle of Universal Amnesty, one which had great notoriety and which for a time affected the fortunes of the *Tribune* adversely. Jefferson Davis petitioned for a writ of habeas corpus to end his long confinement. The writ was granted and the ex-President of the defunct Confederacy admitted to bail. The *Tribune* commented:

Two years have sped since he was captured; and on the 19th of this month two years will have passed since he was immured in Fortress Monroe. In view of these facts, his longer detention in close confinement, while the prosecution refuses him a trial, would be a glaring defiance of the settled principles of civilized jurisprudence and a deep stain upon the honor of our country.

The demand for bail the *Tribune* deemed an "absurd formality," since Davis, after seeking trial for two years, "is not likely at this day to avoid one by shameful flight." It would be more logical to require bail of the government to ensure a speedy trial.

Greeley had a personal interest in this matter of Davis's bail. A friend, George Shea, was the prisoner's attorney-of-record, and had consulted the *Tribune's* editor about bondsmen. Greeley suggested some names and volunteered to serve in person, if necessary. Shea notified Greeley that his signature would be necessary, and he, with Gerrit Smith, another sturdy abolitionist, journeyed to Richmond on April 13, 1867.⁹ It was an event. The press carried full accounts of the proceedings and told how Greeley was the first bondsman called to sign; how the crowd craned to see the man whose slogan just six years before had been "Forward to Richmond!"; how Jefferson Davis pressed the hand of his former foe. Then came the deluge.

The Radicals roared. The *Evening Post* lashed out at Greeley's act and even the *Times* under the Conservative Raymond thought it "wholly needless" on public grounds, and inexplicable "on any conceivable personal grounds." The excitable Wendell Phillips in the *Anti-Slavery Standard* broke forth against the most valuable ally the cause of abolition ever had:

. . . we think nothing has ever proved so conclusively his entire lack of judgment and common sense, his utter inability to comprehend the epoch, the struggle through which the nation has passed or the state in which it stands.

The upshot of the affair has a flavor of comedy. The Union League Club meditated a vote of censure on its recusant member and requested Greeley's presence at a meeting called for that purpose. The editor's wrath had been simmering under the storm of reproach excited by his just and magnanimous action, and he vented it in an open letter in response to this invitation. It was a masterpiece of invective that has often been quoted in full, and so needs no very extensive restatement here. Suffice to say that, after reviewing his course in regard to Universal Amnesty, and proving the consistency of his attitude, Greeley wound up with a magnificent arraignment of his fellow members:

Gentlemen, I shall not attend your meeting this evening. I have an engagement out of town, and shall keep it. I do not recognize you as capable of judging, or even fully apprehending me. You evidently regard me as a weak sentimentalist, misled by a maudlin philosophy. I arraign you as narrow-minded blockheads, who would like to be useful to a great and good cause, but don't know how. Your attempt to base a great, enduring party on the hate and wrath necessarily engendered by a bloody civil war, is as though you should plant a colony on an iceberg which had somehow drifted into a tropical ocean. I tell you here, that, out of a life earnestly devoted to the good of human kind, your children will select my going to Richmond and signing that bail-bond as the wisest act, and will feel that it did more for freedom and humanity than all of you were competent to do, though you had lived to the age of Methuselah.

The Union League Club was properly abashed at this outpouring, and meekly decided that Greeley's action did not call "for proceedings in this Club." Certain other manifestations toward the editor and his paper proved equally transitory. Greeley wrote to a friend shortly after the episode, "They have stopped some *Tribunes* but not so many as I supposed they would. And the paper will live after you and I are dead. They wholly stopped the sale of my History for a time but it is going on again."¹⁰

Despite Greeley's fine work for conciliation through Universal Amnesty, the implications of the other half of his program, Im-

partial Suffrage, drew the *Tribune* ever more closely to the side of the proponents of the policy of coercion. In June, 1866, the Fourteenth Amendment had been presented to the states. It provided that all persons born or naturalized in the United States were citizens thereof, and forbade the abridgment of their civil rights. It provided for the reduction of the representation of any state refusing the vote to any male citizen over twenty-one, unless for "participation in rebellion or other crime." All who had accepted the Confederacy after taking oath to uphold the constitution as officers or legislators of state or nation, were forbidden to hold public office. The debt of the United States was guaranteed and that of the Confederacy expressly declared invalid. In all, it was a curious hodgepodge, expressing the various fears and prejudices of the northern Radicals, but the *Tribune* upheld it stoutly.

When ten of the eleven states lately in rebellion refused to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment, Congress proceeded to supply its guarantees by a harsh regime. The ten recusant states were divided into five military districts, under generals of the army, who were granted extraordinary powers. James G. Blaine, Congressman from Maine, endeavored to fix a term to this Draconian measure by inserting a clause providing that any state which adopted the Fourteenth Amendment and granted negro suffrage would be released from military control. The Blaine amendment was accepted by the Senate, but defeated in the House by "a coalition of all the Democrats with a minority of extreme Republicans." A compromise was reached which retained the essential condition of the amendment, but with the added proviso that those excluded from office by the Fourteenth Amendment were forbidden to vote for the convention which would decide the course of the several states.

The *Tribune* regarded the Military Reconstruction Act as "harsher than we wish," and hoped that the exclusion and disfranchisements would be short-lived; but in essence the paper justified the measure as necessary to maintain order and prevent the killing of loyal men in the South. Even this qualified acquiescence reveals the distance which the *Tribune* had traveled since the 27th of May, 1865. Apart from its effect on the South, the bill established a type of government which Greeley found highly distaste-

ful on general grounds. From the first, the *Tribune* had advocated the supersession of courts martial by civil courts, and in commenting on Johnson's veto of the Freedman's Bureau Bill on July 17, 1866, an editorial remarked:

The President's dislike to military tribunals receives a certain amount of our sympathy. We are anxious to see our army swords turned into plowshares and pruning hooks and our gaily appareled soldiers doing good work in the open farm lands and forests of the North West.

The *Tribune* was also averse to military supervision of elections, and General Grant's refusal to permit the use of troops for such service in Tennessee (the only one of the eleven Confederate states "reconstructed" at this time) brought forth editorial applause:

The most unwelcome sight to a thoughtful American would be a soldier standing guard before the polls of a State which is represented in Congress and is not subject to military rule as a result of rebellion. . . . We want American elections conducted without bloodshed, and would see wrong triumph for a time rather than have right triumph by force.

Yet Greeley was willing to waive his predilection for civil justice and civil elections as well as his hope for the peaceful reorganization of the seceded states in order to secure to the negro "his only weapon of self-defense—the ballot."

The passage of the Military Reconstruction Act brought the quarrel between President and Congress to a head. The *Tribune* in this contest had been uniformly on the side of Congress, since Johnson's veto of the Freedman's Bureau Bill, but the paper long insisted that the two branches of government function as nearly as may be in their separate spheres without too much encroachment. In July, 1866, the paper said:

The President and the Congress have widely differing plans of restoration or Reconstruction. These differences reflect those existing among the People. They have a legal right to differ. So long as each shall keep within the law, there is nothing to excite alarm in their antagonism.

The executive has rights in the premises which the Legislative power can neither ignore nor invade. The President may misuse his discretion, yet be responsible for his errors to the People alone. So Congress may

act unwisely, even perversely, without offering the President any pretext for executive interference.

In consonance with this expression of opinion, Greeley strongly deprecated the movement to impeach Johnson. It would set up a dangerous precedent, said the *Tribune* in January, 1867, whereby a majority in Congress could make and unmake Presidents at will. "Let us walk slowly and survey the ground as we go," urged an editorial. Impeachment must be the last resort, when "no other course remains for the honor of the nation;" a deplorable necessity, one to be avoided if possible and so long as possible. "No patriot will wantonly or lightly shake the twin fabrics of Public Order and Public Credit."

John Russell Young, however, was suspicious of Johnson's intention of enforcing the Reconstruction Acts in good faith, and the *Tribune* approved the attempt of Congress to curb the President's power over his appointees through the passage of the Tenure of Office Act, as necessitated by his abuse of interim appointments.

Young's suspicions seemed justified when Johnson's Attorney General Stanbery permitted a very liberal construction of the test-oath clause of the Reconstruction Act, thus taking the heart out of it, in Greeley's view. The stage was rapidly being set for the catastrophe. Then Johnson removed Stanton, his Secretary of War. The *Tribune* held no brief for that mysterious figure; it was unable to identify his precise role in the drama. J. D. Stockton compared him editorially to "The Man in the Iron Mask or the Veiled Prophet of Khorassan," but held that he was ousted for his virtues and not for his faults. On the whole, the *Tribune* considered Stanton's removal for the good of the cause, since in office he provided a shield for his titular chief.

The *Tribune* was finally won over to impeachment in August of 1867. General Philip Sheridan was the dashing military idol of the war. His personality had a *panache* which the realistic Grant and Sherman lacked. Since Appomattox his course in New Orleans had endeared him to the Radicals; in 1867 his name was an "oriflamme" of their cause. Johnson removed him from his command of the department of Louisiana; Greeley was away in the West, John Russell Young "stepped into the breach."

"The President must stand and fight . . ." trumpeted the *Tribune* on August 28. "The President means war. War be it then, and God speed the right." Continuing, the editorial reviewed the course of the struggle against the President. The initial move toward impeachment had been held unwise, since by the Reconstruction Act the President's course toward the South seemed under the control of Congress. Then Stanbery's construction of the Act made supplementary legislation necessary. Checked in this direction, said the editorial, the President proceeded by use of his power of appointment to stultify the will of Congress. Stanton was removed, Generals Sheridan and Sickles transferred from the South. A "Tammany Democrat" (General Hancock) was appointed in Sheridan's room. Probably Pope, Grant, Howard and Holt would share the fate of the latter. Therefore, "We admonish the people to prepare for a stern and high responsibility."

Let us make the canvass upon the infamy of Mr. Johnson's Administration, and having defeated him at the ballot-box, we can prepare, through our representatives, to consider the best course to be taken to punish him for his crimes against the sovereign will of the American people.

Ominously, this call to arms was immediately followed by an editorial explanation of the technique of impeachment.

"Greeley returned in grief from the Minnesota woods." He asked, "Why hang a man who is bent on hanging himself?" and deplored the introduction of "crazy reprehensible French methods" in American government. But he remained "loyal"; the *Tribune* was committed to impeachment and its editor refused to reverse the paper's course.¹¹ Years later, John Russell Young agreed that his chief had been the wiser, but for the moment the damage was done, and the managing editor grew even more forceful in denouncing Johnson and his supporters.

The canvass proved a disappointment. The Democrats made substantial gains. But Johnson provided the Radicals with the necessary legal ammunition; when the Senate refused to sanction his dismissal of Stanton, and Grant, his interim successor, bowed to the decision, the President defied the Tenure of Office Act and appointed General Thomas as Secretary of War. On February 21,

1868, Thaddeus Stevens moved the impeachment of the President of the United States for "high crimes and misdemeanors."

The trial of Andrew Johnson converted Washington into a madhouse. Greeley, after one experience, dubbed the proceedings a "nightmare," and proceeded to shun them.¹² The delirium spread to the press, and the wildest language appeared. Honorable reputations were assailed and few of the actors in the piece escaped without a liberal coat of mud. And the *Tribune* was not without its share in the promiscuous slandering.

Not all of this was due to its principal editor. Greeley was indeed one of the foremost exponents of what the late Professor James Melvin Lee called "picric journalism." His pen was fond of the blunt epithet, the short and ugly word that describes without circumlocution. During the course of the trial, the *Tribune* called ex-Governor Horatio Seymour a liar, and claimed that the *World* was no better in supporting the alleged fable. The merits of the case are obscure and unimportant, but the New York press visited its wrath on Greeley's head. Bryant of the *Evening Post* had never forgiven the occasion when the *Tribune's* editor applied the same term to him, and he now administered a rather typical rebuke. To give the lie direct, said the *Post*, was ungentlemanly.

It is not only bad manners, . . . it shows an infirm temper and a deplorable lack of words. It is never necessary for a gentleman or a man of culture to call another a liar; that is the resort of the rude and illiterate.

The *Post* preferred the Harvard manner:

"Does the Senator from Massachusetts call me a liar?" roared a Southern Bully, in the old time. "No," calmly replied Mr. Sumner, "I say he has made a statement that has no foundation in fact;" and the bully sat down, overwhelmed by the laughter of the House.

The *Tribune* brushed this aside with the pertinent remark that the act of lying was ungentlemanly, not the word. But, oddly enough, the most vigorous rebuttal of the *Post's* argument came from the *World*, which had just termed Greeley a "Fishwoman." Manton Marble, editor of the *World*, had no mean command of

derogatory idiom, and he ridiculed Bryant's argument that its use denoted a feeble vocabulary. Greeley's writings, he said, were proof positive to the contrary. In conclusion, Marble warned that the *World* would brook no interference in its fight with the *Tribune*, and it resumed that fight with gusto.

But as Greeley was not the sole author of the *Tribune's* opinions, the Impeachment Trial brought out a phase of newspaper style that went beyond even his tolerant vocabulary.

At first the paper urged that the managers adhere to the violation of the Tenure of Office Act as the surest ground of conviction. The dubious articles about "revolutionary utterances" and conspiracy to use force against Congress were "incidental and subordinate," and might be evaded by the defense.

The case itself can only be affected by showing that Andrew Johnson did not attempt to remove Secretary Stanton and appoint Gen. Thomas. Stick to the question, gentlemen; stick to the question.

Yet before long the *Tribune* itself abandoned the technical point against the President, and went to the higher ground of national expediency, as embodied in Republican doctrine; brushing the judicial oath aside, it said:

If it were wise to assail Mr. Johnson for his policy, it is just to punish. His impeachment is the logical consequence of Republicanism, and no Republican can vote against it without making himself infamous. The only alternative is Impeachment or Infamy.

As the *World* remarked, the *Tribune* hooted at its readers "as a drove of pigs to be scared." The *Tribune* was not alone in its dependence on rhetoric rather than reason. If James Rankin Young wrote from Washington that Senator Grimes, a Republican who refused to impeach, sat "as mean, repulsive and noxious as a hedgehog in the cage of a traveling menagerie," the *World's* characterization of the young author as a "windy nincompoop," and its references to the "look of a good-natured idiocy" on Greeley's face, did not strike a much higher level of journalistic taste. The *World's* Washington correspondent even outdid Young, in the difficult feat of painting that resplendent lily, Ben Butler:

So execrable a shape as that of Butler surely never contorted itself before a respectable assemblage. Cushioned in the dreadful hollow of his bald head, and making a footstool of his protruding eyeball, the imp of insolence could fairly be seen to sit. Ugly elves appeared to perch astride his nose and dangle from his flabby ears. His hair was populous with phantoms of hideous creeping things. A bad odor must have exhaled from him—the odor of loathsome hates, meannesses and spites.

And so in a welter of verbosity the trial of a President dragged its slow length. And in the end, the Senate failed to convict Andrew Johnson by a margin of one vote, while the *Tribune* accused the “renegade” Senators of accepting bribes and of yielding to all manner of baser influences. It asked of Senator G. F. Fowler: “Have his locks been shorn by Delilah or has he been corrupted from the bag of Judas?” The upright Trumbull was hinted to have been influenced by the fact that his “Democratic son” wagered \$5,000 on the issue of the case, while William Pitt Fessenden was said to be actuated by political disappointment. In contrast to the murk of the Impeachment Trial, the Presidential campaign of 1868, bitter as it was, came as a breath of fresher air.

For the Radicals, defeated in their efforts to unseat the President, turned to the ballot box to secure their ends. When the verdict of acquittal was given in the Senate Chamber, the *Tribune* adopted a new slogan, “Grant and Victory,” and three days later, on May 21, the paper spoke of the Republican Convention, meeting that day in Chicago:

The name of the illustrious Captain of the Armies will be placed on the ticket with unanimity and enthusiasm. Nor do we question the wisdom that dictates that choice. The doubts that existed as to the position of Gen. Grant have been dispelled by his manly, straightforward, consistent and conscientious course. . . . Today the canvass opens. Let the word be “GRANT AND VICTORY.”

The “doubts” mentioned by the *Tribune* had been serious. The question of Grant’s candidacy was strongly agitated in the fall of 1867, without much encouragement from Greeley’s paper. The *Tribune* had “an abiding conviction that our ablest and most worthy statesman is Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase”; and while praising the “modest good sense” and “practical unostentatious sagacity” of the “taciturn reticent first soldier of the Republic,”

his opposition to the "blood-and-thunder policy" toward the South and the "wisdom and breadth of view" of his terms at Appomattox, the paper decided, rather oddly, that Grant was "by no means a great man or even a very great general." The *Tribune* considered the safety of the negro and the protection of the National Debt as paramount, and demanded some statement on these questions before accepting Grant, that "sashed and girded Sphinx" as John Russell Young termed him.

The *Tribune* harped on this string insistently. On November 13, 1867, it again asserted a preference for Chase "as ablest and most eminent of our living statesmen," but promised to support Grant, Wade, Colfax or any other candidate "should he be nominated on a platform which affirms and upholds the equal political as well as civil rights of all citizens of the republic." Meanwhile the paper objected strongly to obtaining a President "out of a grab-bag."

In the transactions of the next six months the position of Grant as a Radical became clear, while in the same period Chase shifted toward the Conservatives. On May 9, the *Tribune* joined the *Herald* in advocating the adoption of Chase by the Democrats. The next day Greeley wrote to Charles B. Stoer an explanation of the shift.

I urged the nomination of Mr. Chase till nearly every state had, in Republican Convention, nominated Grant. To persevere longer would be factious and mischievous.

Men are of small account in comparison with principles. We must now establish the principle that this is *all men's* government, not that of Whites only. Of that principle Gen. Grant is the . . . standard bearer, and as such I shall support him.¹³

Grant was nominated enthusiastically by the Republicans, but the Democrats refused to accept Chase. Instead, Horatio Seymour and Frank Blair took up the burden of a losing campaign. As was natural, the war was fought all over again. The *Tribune* asked rhetorically, "Citizens, will you vote for the Hero of the New York Riots or the Hero of Vicksburg?"

Every hour we have a new story of the desolation of homes, intimidation, banishment, assassination. These are but the embers of the smouldering Rebellion. Elect Seymour and Blair, and these embers will burst

into a mighty flame, destroying the Republic's peace and threatening the safety of the Union itself.

With nearly all the South still under military rule, Grant's election proved relatively easy. And as the news of Republican majorities flashed to the *Tribune* office it was greeted there as the harbinger of peace, marking the end of division in the government, and bringing a hope that the division in the nation might also be terminated.

We do earnestly believe that Gen. Grant's four years will serve to efface all the ugly scars left by our late fratricidal war; but, if not, we shall have to insist on his serving a second term, and that will certainly see the good work completed. . . .

Our terms of adjustment are the same since as before our triumph—
UNIVERSAL AMNESTY, IMPARTIAL SUFFRAGE.

CHAPTER IV

A NEW FORCE

THE year 1868 witnessed two events of great importance to the *Tribune*. One was the election of General Grant, which, in time, led to a violent breach in the paper's traditional political alliances and nearly brought about its downfall. The other event was the coming of Whitelaw Reid, who was destined to save the *Tribune* from the worst effects of the chapter of accidents which began with Grant's election, and to be the leading spirit of the paper for over forty years.

Whitelaw Reid was thirty-one years of age in 1868, tall and slender, with a drooping moustache and "intelligent eyes" under a sweeping mass of dark hair worn in the "Rebel cut." One of his associates described him as "Theodore Tilton with the angular points rubbed off" ¹—a picturization more graphic to the public of the 'sixties than to the reader today. His manner was already noted for graciousness, but it had the polish of a swiftly running engine, the sheen of a steely will. At thirty-one, Whitelaw Reid had already made his mark.

His career had been a brilliant one. Like Greeley, a product of the farm, Reid's early environment in southern Ohio was less straitened than that which the stony heart of New England granted his chief. Like Greeley again, Reid's boyhood was sickly, but fostering care instead of forced neglect marked the difference between Zaccheus Greeley's poverty and the thrifty competence of Robert Reid. Whereas young Greeley, after some common schooling, received the major part of his education from chance-met books and from life and letters as seen at a type case, Whitelaw Reid secured a bachelor's degree with honors in science and the classics at Miami University.

Reid's childhood and youth, then, were passed in circumstances which to Greeley would have been luxurious. Yet the life of striving which was forced upon the founder of the *Tribune* was not

foreign to the philosophy and temperament of his successor in the conduct of that institution. Though his education and his interest in things of the mind and spirit opened to Reid those professions which are in some degree sheltered from abrasive competition, a driving ambition urged him to the open seas of life. The Reid family was Calvinist in tradition and doctrine, American in birth, and of the frontier by environment; all the canons of the pulpit and home instilled the teaching that culture and grace were not lines of retreat but weapons with which to face the world.

A brief episode as teacher following graduation revealed to Whitelaw Reid that his career demanded a wider field. For a while he fumbled; commerce, government service seemed to call. But before he was twenty-one his destiny was made plain. He secured a part-interest in a local weekly newspaper, the *Xenia News*, and devoted himself to journalism.

The *News* was to Reid what the *Northern Spectator* had been to Greeley, with the additional feature of responsibility. The Vermont apprentice was well grounded in the technique of newspaper publication; Reid had the further educational experience of witnessing the reflex of his technique in circulation and advertising returns. Then, too, while Greeley was setting his contributions to the *Spectator* in type, the country was on the extreme edge of the slavery vortex, while the *News* in 1860 reflected the rushing darkness of the whirlpool's very center. Reid was thrust into politics abruptly and thoroughly.

Reid's control of the *News* lasted from 1858 until the summer of 1860, a little less than two years. In that period the antislavery agitation had reached its climax with the nomination of Lincoln, and the country was poised on the brink of civil war. Reid was an ardent champion of Greeley's views; he read the bound volumes of the *Tribune* devoutly and was an earnest Republican. In that time of emotional stress, party lines were tightly drawn and few of the youth of the 'sixties passed on to the issues of the later Nineteenth Century without bearing their marks. As Reid's biographer, Royal Cortissoz, has said,

Whitelaw Reid was all his life an organization man, and the acquaintance with campaigns of his youth enables us to see why. He was born in the year which witnessed the killing of Lovejoy. From the moment

that he began to think about public affairs—and that, in his generation, was at an early age—he was bound to think of freedom for the slave. Hence the Republican party, which thought hardly about anything else, entered into his life not alone as an external rallying-point but as a kind of moral agent, crystallizing his ideas and emotions.²

Secession gave Reid not only a cause to fight for but an opportunity in the profession he had chosen. Ill health sent him from the little office of the *Xenia News* to the North Woods. On his return, he went to Columbus to witness the exciting reactions of the Ohio legislature during the tense session of the Spring of 1861. He was able to secure the post of legislative correspondent for three Ohio papers, and so impressed one of them, the *Cincinnati Gazette*, that at the end of the session he was offered the post of City Editor on that flourishing sheet.

Reid did not remain in the office long; secession led to war and armed conflict broke out in Western Virginia, almost at the *Gazette's* back door. The young city editor was dispatched to the front, where his dispatches, under the pen-name of "Agate," earned him the right to follow the armies of the Union to more decisive fields. Thus it was that, in 1862, Reid, ill abed in the tent of General Lew Wallace at Crump's Landing on the Tennessee, heard the shells bursting around Shiloh Church a few miles up the river and found there a bloody battle and a reputation.

Reid's account of the battle of Shiloh, or Pittsburg Landing, made a sensation. The reporter arrived on the scene of action simultaneously with General Grant, and from eyewitnesses compiled a story of the opening phases of the battle that was exceedingly damaging to the reputation of William T. Sherman. The discussion as to whether Sherman was surprised at Shiloh or not still flickers. To the layman it would seem that he was at least rather startled when the Confederates appeared from the brush. The magnitude of the combat and the dramatic recovery of the Union forces would have been sufficient to make a correspondent's name; with the element of controversy added, "Agate" attained nation-wide fame.

His success at Shiloh led to Reid's transfer to the most coveted position in American reportorial life, correspondent at Washington. The value to the future editor of the *Tribune* was incalculable.

He made contacts with the most important figures in the American political and journalistic scene. Greeley and John Russell Young were acquaintances of that period. Sumner, Ben Wade, Henry Winter Davis, Salmon P. Chase and Thaddeus Stevens were political intimates. Financial interests centering on the capital came within Reid's ken and he became associated with Jay Cooke, the greatest American banker of the day. With Young, Reid assisted in the opening of Cooke's New York office for the sale of government bonds, and Cooke obtained for Reid a loan to purchase an interest in the *Gazette*.³ "Agate" thus began a close association with those realms of journalism, politics and finance which were to be his particular field in years to come.

In a personal way Reid gained by his stay in Washington. There he met John Hay, Lincoln's secretary, and Edmund Clarence Stedman, the poet, his close friends for life. But most valuable of all was the close experience of the ways of American politics which Washington offered. Reid's practical mind, unclouded by visions, saw and retained the details of the raw machinery of American government. And all the while his prestige grew.

When the war ended, Reid became intimately acquainted with America's most pressing problem—the reconstruction of the seceded states. First, in normal journalistic course, he visited the South as a reporter with Salmon P. Chase's tour of inspection in the spring of 1865 and a little later made an independent investigation for his paper. These visits impressed Reid with a sense of the economic possibilities of the stricken region; journalism palled and he invested in cotton lands in Louisiana. Worms, mud and fever proved too much for the immigrant from the Ohio grain lands and, though he succeeded in recouping his losses by a better venture in Alabama, Reid was confirmed in his choice of the pen rather than the plow.

The Southern interlude was fruitful after a different fashion. Reid in Washington was the supporter of the Radical policies of Sumner and Wade. Life in the South satisfied him of the essential wisdom of these policies, but qualifiedly; he was ready in time to recognize their failure and support Hayes in 1876. While chasing worms from his cotton plants, Reid embodied his views in a book *After the War*, which evidences some trace of this skepticism.

After the War is, on the whole, a remarkably clear and temperate survey. Reid found the Southern white men "loyal" . . . in the sense of enforced submission to the government," but he believed they had no intentions of further opposition to Federal authority. Instead, with an acute prevision of the "Solid South" he wrote:

A "war within the Union" for their rights, seems now to be the universal policy—a war in which they will act as a unit with whatever party at the North favors the fewest possible changes from the old order of things, and leaves them most at liberty to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way.⁴

Reid was evidently dubious as to the immediate disposition of the negro question. The freedmen, he wrote "are not such material as, under ordinary circumstances, one would now choose for the duties of American citizenship." But he was confident that they were adapting themselves readily and could not be ignored. "Their order and industry are the only guaranty for the speedy return of prosperity to the South."⁵ This was fairly conservative doctrine.

The *Tribune* praised the volume, however, for its Radicalism. It was, said the reviewer, the work of "an experienced and well-known journalist" who was "no admirer of Mr. Johnson's 'policy,' and not much of a believer in Southern white Unionism."

The excursion into agriculture came to an end in 1868. Reid returned to the *Gazette*, a stockholder, chief editorial writer and star correspondent. And now Greeley began to angle for his services. Reid had received many tempting offers, from the *New York Times*, the *St. Louis Democrat* and the *New Orleans Times*. He was invited to become editor-in-chief of the *Nation* at its founding. The ties that held him to the *Gazette* were strong, and he resisted these earlier offers. The bait that Greeley offered was far more alluring. He referred to his intention of leaving the active direction of the *Tribune* and strongly advised that Reid buy stock in the concern, implying a flattering future in America's foremost newspaper. John Russell Young added his pleas to those of his chief, and in the end Reid succumbed. In the fall of 1868 he became First Writing Editor of the *Tribune*.

He held this position but a few months. From the first he felt that it was a transitory phase; that he was being held in reserve for more important tasks.

"Writing editor" was the phrase then in use for editorial writer—Reid's title may be more familiar if translated into Chief Editorial Writer. But this implied no real influence over the paper's opinions; that was the province of the editor-in-chief and his managing editor. According to W. F. G. Shanks, then on the *Herald*, the Writing Editors were, relative to their associates, in the position of college seniors; they had prestige without actual authority.⁶

In the course of his duties Reid dealt with many subjects, writing one day on the salaries of government clerks, the fur and seal trade in the islands of St. Paul and St. George, the revision of the Department of the Interior, and "a little piece on salt." His style was clear, practical and direct; vigorous, without superfluous adornment. It harmonized well with Reid's new *milieu* which took its tone from Greeley. But in its exercise Reid felt that he was really "A Rod in Pickle," a threat held over those in high place. And his presence in the office of the *Tribune* he considered in a similar light. As a letter to General James A. Garfield, a close friend, expressed it:

I do not think he (Greeley) wants me to displace Young, only to show him that he could be displaced at a moment's notice. Still there are some of the stockholders who believe the gossip of the evening papers, that I am to go in soon after the 1st of January. I can't say that I greatly desire it. For the present I am doing well,—pecuniarily and in the way of experience and influence. For the future, I still look longingly to a chance for study and careful literary work. . . .⁷

Greeley's exact intentions are difficult to determine. Probably Reid was correct in attributing his position to a desire on the editor's part to have two good strings to his bow, but Young's eventual downfall was not Greeley's wish. It was the product of his own ambition and, it may fairly be said, the malice of one of his predecessors in the managing editorship of the *Tribune*.

Charles A. Dana is one of the great figures in American journalism. As the elder Bennett stands for skill and aggressiveness in newsgathering, and Greeley for the force of editorial opinion,

Dana and the *Sun* represent the highest literary form in news presentation. Yet Dana's record has its peculiar phases. With curious perversity he took the unpopular and usually the wrong side of almost every public question he discussed, and his malignancy toward his foes was unedifying. Dana adopted toward his old comrade, Greeley, a tone of patronizing loyalty, but Greeley's associates and successors were relentlessly pursued.

Henry Watterson ascribed this attitude of Dana to an almost pathological hatred for anyone succeeding him in the managing editorship of the *Tribune*.⁸ The first manifestation appeared soon after a group of capitalists placed Dana in command of the *Sun* in 1868; it recurred constantly during the rest of Dana's life, to the embarrassment of the *Tribune's* management.

John Russell Young was the first to feel the weight of Dana's ill-feeling. In 1867, Young and John D. Stockton had founded the *Philadelphia Morning Post*, Stockton taking up his residence in that city as editor, though still contributing frequent articles to the *Tribune's* editorial page. The existing Philadelphia papers were closely allied with the New York Associated Press, and the latter refused the new journal its dispatches "on any terms." Coupled with the slender financial resources of the partners, this was a serious hindrance to the success of the new venture, and Stockton and Young were impelled to desperate shifts.

On April 27, 1869, the *Sun* published four columns of Young's private letters, obtained in some mysterious fashion, pertaining to the *Morning Post*. The most serious feature of this correspondence was that it apparently showed that Young had used his position on the *Tribune* to send Associated Press dispatches to his Philadelphia paper, contrary to the strict by-laws of the Association. Dana claimed (and Greeley admitted) that the editor of the *Tribune* had seen the letters, and that as a member of the Associated Press the *Sun* was justified in thus forcing Greeley's hand. The animus of the *Sun's* director is revealed by the inclusion of letters having no bearing on the charge, but indicating Young's personal opinion of some of his colleagues.

Greeley was greatly wrought up over the affair. The publicity given to the letters made it impossible to save Young's position or his face, despite Dana's Pecksniffian parade of magnanimity in

offering, on the *Sun's* part, to waive the penalties demanded by the Associated Press, and hoping "that the *Tribune* will treat Mr. Young as forbearingly as we do." The best that Greeley could do for his managing editor was to abolish the office in accepting his resignation. On May 14, Greeley wrote and posted in the editorial rooms "a somewhat famous general order."

The office of managing editor is abolished, and Mr. Whitelaw Reid will see that Mr. Greeley's orders are obeyed, and give instructions at any time in his absence to subordinates.⁹

That this move was merely nominal was recognized by Reid, by his associates in the office, and by the *Sun*. Reid's title might be that of First Assistant but his duties were those of managing editor.

To this post Reid brought the intensive experience of his years of newspaper service, clear-sighted energy and an unrivaled tact in the handling of men. His relations with his chief were much like those of Young. Greeley was frequently absent from the office as before; he lectured 50 or 60 times a year and visited Washington or Albany once a month. His assistant was forced to catch flying interviews or learn the editor's wishes through the medium of hasty notes in Greeley's execrable scrawl. The *Tribune's* policies were still directed by its founder's forceful leaders (he still wrote at least two columns daily for the paper), but the routine of office was in the hands of the First Assistant. The situation is made plain by a letter of Reid's, one of scores by which he kept his superior informed of events in the paper:

I need not say that personally I shall be more than glad of your return whenever you feel that you can come. I am always sorry when you leave and delighted when you get within consulting distance. I am willing to do any amount of work and would gladly relieve you of four-fifths of that which harasses you when here, but I feel more comfortable when once in 24 or 48 hours I can get to you for advice and counsel.¹⁰

On his part, Greeley was inclined to give Reid a free rein in matters of discipline and personnel. Occasionally he would blast some unfortunate reporter or complain if his editorials were not

promptly placed in the paper. But in general his policy was as stated in this letter to W. L. Stone:

If you were manager of the *Tribune*, and held responsible by the Editor for the perfection of its various departments, you would esteem it but right that you should fill those departments with men of your own choice. Mr. Reid (now absent) is such a manager and I do not overrule him in the choice of his helpers.¹¹

Reid's relations with his staff were on the same plane of confidence. The new managing editor was surrounded by a wall of reserve, the product of his ancestry and his single-handed rise to position. For no man, probably, could this barrier be removed—the essential Reid would remain something of a mystery to his most intimate friends. Outliving most of his early contemporaries, Reid stands in memories today as a rather remote figure, wrapped in grave courtesy as in a mantle, completely devoid of the sharp idiosyncrasies that gave Greeley, for instance, such an eccentric yet human character. But in the Whitelaw Reid of the close contacts of *Tribune* life in the 'seventies, we see other facets. The courteous demeanor cloaked both energy and sympathy, and his associates responded with loyalty and good work.

In his conduct of the office Reid demanded discipline and the utmost exertion on the part of his subordinates. But the discipline was tempered by tact, while even his enemies were impressed by the fact that he demanded no more effort on the part of his assistants than he was willing to put forth himself. The "rigid system, rigidly enforced" of the office was made more humane by his graciousness, and the jealousies inevitably aroused by a swift rise to place were at least partially allayed by the managing editor's willingness to coöperate to the extent of his strength—and by the outstanding success which he was able to invoke.

For Whitelaw Reid was a fine newspaperman. The earnest given by his varied career on the *Gazette* was fulfilled in the role he assumed in 1869. The *Tribune* in the next few years engaged in a battle of opinion which was more crucial, so far as the paper itself was concerned, than any which preceded. Reid, though he did little writing after becoming manager, was active in this editorial struggle. But he never forgot that he was in charge

of a newspaper, and the *Tribune* under his direction well maintained its reputation for newsgathering; in fact, it surpassed previous efforts.

In this, Reid was aided by circumstance and by efficient collaborators, both of which he exploited fully. The years from 1869 to 1872 were rich in news material, foreign and domestic, and when these sources showed signs of failing, Reid made news.

The first opportunity that came his way was the outbreak of war between France and Prussia, with the lesser German states aligning themselves for the first time in centuries in a common effort. It was a historical event, and public interest on this side of the water was heightened by partizanship with one or another of the belligerents. The South inclined toward Napoleon III because of his helpful gestures during the Civil War; the North opposed him for the same reason, and favored Germany, impressed by that fine tide of immigration which followed '48 and the Union activity of Mid-Western Germans in the debatable ground of Missouri and Southern Ohio. The *Tribune* fully shared these prejudices editorially, and the anti-Bonaparte sentiments of the paper gave spice to the news accounts of Prussian victories.

In reporting the war, the *Tribune* benefited greatly from the preliminary work of George W. Smalley. In 1866, the latter, together with Henry Villard, had missed the Austro-Prussian War completely; news took ten days or more to cross the ocean and von Moltke's tactics were swifter than the correspondents. By 1870, Smalley had established himself in London, consolidated his position at the end of the cable, and was able to organize his staff in time to catch the first blows of the campaign.

For his part, Reid gave his London agent full confidence and coöperation. Smalley decided that he could serve the paper best by remaining at London and retaining in his hands the threads of the various operations. Reid was a bit dubious of a policy which would keep his best and most experienced war correspondent far from the front, especially in view of the fact that the dean of the guild, William Russell, had been secured for the *Sun*, while the *Herald* could always be depended on for extraordinary exertions in the field. Nevertheless, he wisely permitted Smalley to follow his own judgment, and gave him *carte blanche* as to expenses:

For the next two months, if the war should last so long, remember that we look to you to keep us ahead of any other paper in New York on war news, and place no limitations upon your expenditures save that in case they should seem likely to reach extraordinary amounts you should keep us regularly and early advised of them.¹²

With this confident backing, Smalley was put on his mettle and displayed an initiative and administrative skill which put the *Tribune* far ahead of its competitors in bringing the war to the American public. His staff bore witness to his acumen in the judging of men. Joseph Hance, the paper's regular Berlin correspondent, was set on the track of the Prussian armies, while M. Chamerauzan, Paris correspondent, remained in that city to observe the reactions of government and public. Holt White, representing the *London Pall Mall Gazette*, went to the front for the *Tribune*, proving Smalley's most successful discovery. Gustav Muller and a Frenchman named Mejanel distinguished themselves on the regular establishment.

In addition to this standing army, Smalley was quick to exploit the services of various guerrillas; a mysterious source in the French headquarters promised authoritative—and expensive—information; Sir Charles Dilke agreed to send occasional communications; and Greeley's old friend and correspondent, Moncure D. Conway, then acting for the *London Daily Telegraph*, furnished a beat of sensational proportions.

Smalley rounded out his organization by a stroke that is a commonplace of journalism today but which aroused much comment at the time. He formed an alliance with the *London News*, under the terms of which the two papers pooled their resources and published simultaneously. It was the first arrangement of the kind, and proved highly successful. In the dramatic initial stages of the war, the *News* was undoubtedly the gainer by reason of the ingenuity and courage of the *Tribune* men. But the *Tribune* was compensated by the more complete coverage which the alliance afforded, and, after Sedan, by the work of Archibald Forbes, one of the greatest of war correspondents.

The *Tribune* secured its effects through the individual abilities of its staff of writers and through their freedom in the use of the wires—whose services Smalley had grown to respect in the Civil

War, while the European newsmen were still somewhat in awe of the expensive appliance. Hance received the credit for sending the first telegraphic account of a European battle; his name was so mishandled for posterity, however, that he secured little benefit thereby. While newspapermen of the next generation were paying their respects to Hands or Hans, the modest author of the feat was discovered by Richard Harding Davis quietly ensconced in a minor Cuban consulate.¹³ Holt White also caused amazement in conservative British newspaper circles by his audacious telegraphing—the *News* had to be shown the telegraph forms before they would believe that one of his dispatches had been transmitted by that means.

Apart from their use of the wires, Hance, White and the rest achieved personal triumphs which redounded to the *Tribune's* credit and profit. While Smalley "grilled over a slow fire" of impatience in London, fretting at his dependence on other men, the *Tribune* corps sent in beat after beat. Moncure D. Conway was the first man in London with the story of Gravelotte; Holt White's account of the same battle compelled the admiration of even jealous competitors; while Hance, though somewhat delayed and roughly handled by the French detachment which captured him, came through in fine style.

After this encouraging beginning, the campaign climaxed swiftly. The opening days of September found Napoleon and his army pinned against the Belgian frontier awaiting the *coup de grâce*. Holt White was there, chafing because he could not precede the King of Prussia to the scene of action. And as he sat on his little mare he witnessed the Third Empire shatter itself in vain charges against the stolid German infantry. A white flag went out, an Emperor was prisoner. White rode off the field, against the advice of his friends, picked his way through suspicious German sentries, disorganized bands of French troops and nervous Belgian border patrols, only to have his account refused as improbable by skeptical telegraph officials in Brussels. Undaunted, he kept on his way and reached London with his story. With brief respite for dinner, he sat down to compose his story, Smalley transcribing it for the cables. At 3 A. M. it was on the wire, and the *Tribune* beat the town by two days.

During the remainder of the war the *Tribune* kept up its pace. Mejanel was the last reporter on the field with MacMahon; Muller scooped the press with an account of beleaguered Metz. The long siege of Paris was adequately covered, and when old King Wilhelm received the imperial crown of the new Germany, the *Tribune* could with justice place a diadem upon its own inky brow. Reid's confidence in Smalley had been amply justified; White, Hance, Muller, Mejanel and the rest had thoroughly taken the wind out of the great Russell's sails, and for once the *Herald* knew a master.

The cost to the *Tribune* had been high; the brief war cost more to report than had the long Civil War. Cable tolls loomed stupendously in the modest budgets of 1870 and 1871; the expense of discussing the initial organization cost over \$100 a day, while, at the height of excitement, Smalley's cable bills in four days amounted to \$4,000. The total outlay required to place the conflict on the wires was \$125,506.97; ¹⁴ not a great deal in this day and age, but awe-inspiring then. Yet, after all, it was a small price to pay for the privilege of bearing this quiet tag on the front page:

The *Tribune* is the only newspaper in the United States fully represented by Special Correspondents with both Prussian and French armies and at the leading capitals; and is the only paper receiving full special dispatches. Thus far the *Tribune* dispatches have been used, in an imperfect form, by the *New-York Herald*, *World*, *Times* and *Sun*. They were so used yesterday by the *New-York Herald* and *Sun*.

But for all the *Tribune's* preoccupation with affairs martial and foreign, Whitelaw Reid did not neglect civil affairs on the home front. Here competition was entering on an acute stage. The slim, concise city items of Young's day had been constricted by the interest aroused by the Civil War in out-of-town dispatches, the public delight in that new toy, the cable, and Greeley's aversion to crime news. With 1870 came a change in the *Tribune's* attitude toward the presentation of local news, a more liberal space allowance to reports of trials and a more energetic cultivation of the latent possibilities of the city as a field for news.

A great reporter who served his apprenticeship under Reid, Julius Chambers, has recorded his opinion that the so-called "yellow journalism" of the 'nineties was pallid in comparison with the newspapers of his early career.¹⁵ This is difficult to believe, gazing

at the sober type dress, the restrained and factual verbiage of the *Tribune* at this time—yet an inspection of the material handled and the methods of its acquisition goes far to prove the contention. For instance, Greeley's Great Moral Organ, "with the coöperation of 'The Allen,' a notorious scoundrel, conducted a 'badger-house' for a fortnight, where women lured strangers and robbed them. This was done to prove police inefficiency." ¹⁶ Verily this was, in Chambers's phrase, "scarlet" journalism with a vengeance!

In the matter of exposing governmental corruption, the papers of the 'seventies were far more enterprising than ever since, and their methods were frequently sensational. The celebrated instance of the publication of the Tweed Ring accounts by the *Times* is the best illustration of this; a public service which has never been duplicated. In this affair the *Tribune* was undoubtedly "scooped," and Reid was forced to confine his activities against the Ring to covering the aftermath of that famous journalistic thunderbolt. But in other directions Reid proved a worthy competitor.

The *Tribune* laid bare the fraudulent methods of the Health Officer of the Port of New York; it broke up a gang of river pirates; it actually had a reporter duly confined in Bloomingdale Asylum, to the great discomfiture of venal doctors, careless judges and brutal and incapable keepers. The paper's exposure of frauds in the New York Customs House was a revelation of such political importance that it deserves place in the chapter devoted to the politics of the Grant regime, but another episode of Reid's term as managing editor may properly be treated here.

A great subject of discussion in this country during the years following the Civil War was the responsibility of Great Britain for the damage done American shipping by Confederate cruisers. In the spring of 1871, the question had reached the stage of a treaty between the two disputants, and the Senate was in executive session over the terms. To avoid embarrassing public comment, the exact wording of the treaty was held rigidly secret, only a general summary of the provisions being issued to the press. To ensure against "leaks," the printing of the treaty was closely supervised by a confidential clerk of the Senate; imperfect copies were instantly destroyed and the completed set kept under lock

and key, available only to Senators.

In spite of these precautions, the country was amazed to find the full text of the treaty published in the *Tribune* on May 11, 1871. The paper explained editorially that it felt that "the semi-official announcement of the purport" of the agreement was insufficient, that "it is of the utmost importance to the Administration, as well as to the general welfare, that these questions shall now be passed upon finally, with full knowledge and understanding of all the circumstances," and therefore the *Tribune* had spared "neither pains nor expense" in order to obtain and place before the public a definitive copy of the document.

The competing press promptly turned bright green and copied the *Tribune's* version of the treaty—even to typographical errors. The Senate became apoplectic and threatened dire penalties. One enthusiastic member of the Committee on Foreign Relations swore he'd have the truth if it were necessary to fetch every correspondent on Newspaper Row before the bar and confine them with nothing but bread and water. Zebulon White, a recent and brilliant addition to the *Tribune* staff, and Ramsdell, a trusted reporter, were in charge of the paper's Bureau at Washington. They were summoned before the Senate and placed in the custody of the Sergeant-at-arms—but the imprisonment and fare were far more attractive than the threats of outraged Senators indicated. Good rooms, the best of food and the company of their friends made their lot tolerable even without the solatium of doubled pay and the praise of their chief.

The Senate was unable to discover the source of the *Tribune's* information. As in the case of Burdick and Curtin, forty years later, White and Ramsdell refused to divulge the identity of their informant on the ground that it would be a breach of professional honor. The most that the lawmakers could extort from them was the assurance that none of the Senators nor any of the officials connected with it were responsible. As the *Tribune* said editorially, "If the government can't keep its own secrets, we do not propose to undertake the contract." The unrepentant reporters were released at the end of the session.

The *Tribune* gained materially by this episode. The heckling of its correspondents cost about \$800 in lawyers' fees and in-

creased pay, but, as Reid told the stockholders, "It is doubtful whether the same amount of advertising could have been procured in any other way for \$8,000." ¹⁷

The treatment of crime news under Reid's management is a point that need not be labored. It was fuller than had been the practice previously on the paper; trials were reported extensively, but without any offensive elaboration of the "sob-sister" variety. The restrictions of the "Grocer's Bill" were rigidly maintained and the *Tribune* accounts were noted for their accuracy.

One *cause célèbre* of the winter of '69-'70 struck very close to the paper itself. One evening in November, while Albert D. Richardson was standing in the *Tribune's* countingroom receiving his mail, he was shot and fatally wounded by Daniel McFarland. The assassin accused his victim of intimacy with Mrs. McFarland, who had divorced her husband some time previously. Greeley was greatly wrought up over the business; his competitors struck tremendous moral attitudes and afflicted him with a plague of reporters. Henry Ward Beecher married Mrs. McFarland to Richardson at the dying man's bedside. It was great copy for the rest of Park Row, but bitter to the *Tribune*, mourning the loss of a vivid personality.

Reid did his duty, both to the paper and to the murdered man. The trial was covered fairly and the evil of private justice pointedly illustrated, as well as the fallacy of the argument of "temporary insanity" alleged by the defendant. Mrs. Richardson's story was set forth over her signature on the front page—a technique somewhat over-familiar today. Later she became a regular contributor to the paper, and a successful play reader and adapter for Daniel Frohman.

In his conduct of the *Tribune's* news columns Reid revealed himself as an alert and aggressive managing editor. A large part of his success was due to wise selection and tactful handling of subordinates. Reid believed firmly that the executive's duty was to select his man, outline the general policy, and leave the details to those whose task was to carry them out. He demanded much, he was willing to coöperate freely, but he had confidence in his associates. A notable example of this was the manner in which he supported, without interference, Smalley in the conduct of the

London Bureau.

Another good servant in whom Reid trusted, was W. F. G. Shanks, Reid's city editor for many years. Shanks was trained in the hard school of the *Herald*, both in war correspondence and in the city room. He came to the *Tribune* to succeed E. B. Moore, who in turn had succeeded Amos Cummings, when the latter resigned in 1869. Cummings's resignation, according to his own account, was due to the displeasure of the management of the Great Moral Organ at his much swearing.

Whitelaw Reid had another side to his character, in addition to that revealed by the vigorous search for news. Reid was a college graduate, a rather rare bird in American journalism at that time, and he had an appreciation of the value of formal education which was in advance of his day. Now, with parchments and diplomas enough in every newspaper office in the city to paper the Empire State Building, it is hard to realize that at one time a degree, a pair of gloves or hair parted in the middle were badges of suspicion, handicaps to be overcome. In the *Tribune*, for all its cultural tradition, Greeley was especially averse to the products of the college. His theory was that for the average young man (or woman) the practice of a trade was far better education for life than the book-knowledge of the schools, and he had a certain aversion to admitting those trained in the latter method within the *Tribune*. One young hopeful, fresh from Cornell, was brusquely dismissed with the exclamation, delivered in Greeley's "shrill, squeaky voice . . . so harshly falsetto, so unsympathetic"—"I'd a damn sight rather you had graduated at a printer's case!"¹⁸

Hence "collegiate graduates" were unusual enough on the *Tribune* to be conspicuous during Young's administration, though they included such fine newspapermen as Zebulon White, E. H. Clement, the night city editor, Smalley, and Reid himself. Under the latter, a change in attitude became manifest. Reid believed theoretically in the need for the educated men in active life, as his favorite oration "The Scholar in Politics," his long connection and lively interest in the Board of Regents of New York State, and his position as one of the first trustees of the Pulitzer School of Journalism testify. He even suffered some ridicule because of this propensity at first; when he lectured on Journalism at New

York University in 1872, he received a nickname from his contemporaries that still retains its derisory significance—the *Times* called him “The Professor.”

This interest in things of the mind, coupled with Reid’s charm of manner, made him acceptable to men who were repelled by Greeley’s homespun crudity. Readily adaptable, the new manager of the *Tribune* mingled in the best of New York’s intellectual life and the contacts he made at the Century and Lotos Clubs were to figure in the future history of the paper. For example, John Bigelow found Horace Greeley not at all to his fastidious taste, but became an intimate friend of Reid, and the *Tribune* gained a valuable contributor thereby. Bigelow, from a diplomatic post at Berlin, furnished the paper with penetrating comment on the policy of the new German Empire.

Reid applied his theories in practice. He opened the *Tribune’s* doors to college graduates, and secured some of his most successful recruits from this group. The Cornell graduate whom Greeley so unceremoniously dismissed, Reid welcomed as a brother in Delta Kappa Epsilon, and Julius Chambers proved his worth as a hard-headed and courageous reporter. About the same time, the *Tribune* also received Joseph Bucklin Bishop into its ranks, fresh from Brown. As the years passed, and the proportion of college students increased, the list grew longer. This policy did not radically alter the character of the *Tribune*; the paper, if anything, grew less idealistic as the members of the Greeley coterie passed on, while its reputation as a literary force had been fashioned long since. The distinction at that time between the learned and unlearned—in an academic sense—was even more technical and less important than today. But Reid’s attitude seems worthy of comment, both as a prophecy of the future and as illustrating his concept of Pegasus in harness, the Scholar in Politics, Pan in Wall Street.

The most apt illustration of Pan in Wall Street is the author of the poem of that name, Edmund Clarence Stedman. He appeared frequently in the *Tribune* and was a lifelong friend of Reid. His natural expression was in verse and his most famous contribution to journalism was his poetic warning to the South after John Brown’s Raid. The needs of the flesh, however, sent

him into the brokerage business and the *Tribune* published his prose comments on the Gold Conspiracy of 1869.

More important in the *Tribune's* story is another literary figure whom Whitelaw Reid brought under the discipline of journalism—to the profit of all concerned. When John Hay left the White House, his position as Lincoln's secretary as well as his innate charm opened many vistas. Like Stedman, Hay was torn between a desire to write and the need to support himself. But somewhat less romantic than his fellow poet, he made a happier compromise, and at Reid's invitation joined the *Tribune* as editorial writer.

This move was not accomplished without some difficulty. Hay was diffident about his own powers, a modesty which he never wholly lost, and the atmosphere of Greeley's newspaper was apt to be a trifle chill for the man who had acted as Lincoln's agent in the Niagara Falls episode. Hay toyed with the idea of succeeding Clarence Cook as Paris Correspondent of the paper; his terms as Secretary of Legation in Paris, Vienna and Madrid had imbued him with a taste for continental life and society. Reid wisely advised against it, suggesting that Hay serve instead as "a sort of heavy-swell correspondent" at Washington; "whereat" wrote Hay, "I rather reluct."¹⁹ Hay contributed some articles on miscellaneous topics from Washington during the fall of 1870, by way of getting his hand in, and studied the files of the *Tribune* for three or four years back to catch the style. In December of the same year, he entered upon his duties, writing editorials.

His success was instantaneous. Greeley was absent at the time of Hay's arrival and on his return was annoyed at the presence of this living reminder of his fiasco at Niagara Falls. But his wrath was assuaged by the fine work of Reid's protégé, and he proclaimed Hay the most brilliant man who had ever entered the *Tribune*. Hay's diplomatic career, short though it was, qualified him as an expert on European affairs, and his style was rapidly formed under the constant practice and critical survey of a daily newspaper. He retained his sparkling freshness, going for "them kings" with youthful gusto, but added a polish which gave his work real literary value.

In addition to his editorial labors, Hay shared several other functions with the unspecialized staff. As a reporter he received

great acclaim for his accounts of the Chicago fire, although with his accustomed modesty he ascribed the chief share of the honors to an experienced Irish assistant.²⁰ Book reviewing also came within Hay's field, and the first of his Pike County Ballads, excellent examples of the *genre* or local color school of Bret Harte, Joaquin Miller and Mark Twain, were published in the paper.

But Hay's greatest service to the paper lay apart from his formal duties. In Reid, a year his senior, Hay found the forceful complement of his own easy-going nature—and in his turn supplied color and warmth to Reid's reserve and practicality. The two formed a partnership that endured long beyond the younger man's active connection with the *Tribune*. Similar in political thought and diverse in character, the friendship of Hay and Reid was a factor in the development of the paper.

Hay was a good worker and dependable in emergencies, but fond of the lighter side of life in the city. We see him sitting up with Reid past the hour when all the other editorial writers had left the Row—to beat the rest of the press with a comment on a last-minute development in the destruction of the Tweed Ring. Then Reid would find a pert note on his desk:

Farewell, I hear a voice you cannot see. It is at Newburgh. I will meet you at the Century tomorrow at a ghastly late hour, very drunk. For tonight the G.M.O. (The Great Moral Organ) will worry along without
J. H.²¹

Dinner at Delmonico's, at Martin's, at "The Brigands," festive evenings at the Century, which ended in boyish leap-frog over the ash cans, brightened weary hours under the flickering gaslights in the "old rookery." And as the storm-clouds gathered round the *Tribune*, Greeley's assistant drew strength from the gay courage of his friend, and material aid from his generous helpfulness. For a crisis had arrived. Greeley did not retire from the paper in 1869 as he had planned—perhaps the withdrawal of Young held him to his chair a while longer—and disaster overtook him.

CHAPTER V

THE ROAD TO REVOLT

A SQUARE-BUILT, bearded man in black stood in a portico of the Capitol on March 4, 1869. Gruffly and somewhat self-consciously he repeated the simple, tremendous words that were his formal initiation into the Presidency of the United States. In the presence of a great cheering crowd, the curtain went up on one of the most shameful dramas that the country has witnessed, a tragedy of corruption that revolved about the sturdy figure of the Soldier President, Ulysses S. Grant.

Grant in the White House was invested with enormous prestige. He was the living symbol of the war, he represented, to the North, at least, unified counsels after the bitter partizan strife of the last four years. The *Tribune* phrased the sentiments of its great clientèle and half the nation besides when it said exultantly: "In the election of Gen. Grant the people have secured that for which they fought—Union, Peace and Equal Rights for all Men!"

The problems surrounding the new Administration were grave and complex. The emotionalism which had marked the treatment of Reconstruction was subsiding, and the difficult questions which that domineering issue had held in abeyance were bound to come to the fore. The early months of 1869 found an active discussion in the press concerning the affairs with which Grant would have to deal, and their sum was imposing. In the light of these premonitory wranglings, the course of the *Tribune* in the next four years is more easily understood.

The problem of the South, the *Tribune* felt, had been largely solved by the Reconstruction Acts, and the paper was inclined to regard that issue as closed. True, a fraction of the unreconstructed still chose "to put on masks and ride about at midnight," burning negro schools and whipping the blacks, and the negro militia were sometimes obstreperous. Nevertheless, as 1869 opened, the *Tribune* felt that the South was "looking up."

But there were other potential themes of strife. The chief of these was the tariff. The Morrill Act, passed as an emergency measure in wartime, was causing much discontent, particularly in the West. Republicans bound to the party by the issues of Slavery and the Union were growing restive as the strength of those ties diminished and Protection was substituted as a major tenet of party faith. This mutinous spirit had been growing ever since the war; indeed, it is the opinion of Howard K. Beale that President Johnson could have split the ranks of his opponents by a judicious fostering thereof.¹

The *Tribune's* stand on the tariff was as uncompromising as might be expected. Though the paper acknowledged that it is "agreed on all hands that revision of the present tariff is advisable," Greeley refused to abandon the protective principle. If any revision is made, said he, let it be in those schedules which do not protect American goods, in tea and coffee duties, for instance. Later he proposed a scheme which has a curiously inverted appearance to modern eyes. The country is consuming more than it can produce (this was in 1870!); the balance of trade is unfavorable. Let the currency be rigorously deflated, with the tariff maintained at existing levels. Wages and prices will fall, and home industry will be able to compete with foreign products.

The problem of the currency was another heritage of the war which met Grant at his inaugural. During the war, large quantities of paper money, "greenbacks," legal tender for all debts except customs duties or interest on the public debt, had been issued by the government. Specie payment had been suspended by the banks, and the paper money fluctuated with the fortunes of war. The *Tribune* published the daily gold quotation at the head of its editorial page; at one time in 1864 it required \$2.83 in paper to buy a gold dollar, but at the end of the war the price was about \$1.45. During Johnson's troubled administration nothing constructive was done for the currency.

Sound money was one of Greeley's fetishes; the "greenbacks" were a standing reproach to his economic notions and he wished them abolished. Resumption of specie payment was his goal, and he urged it constantly upon the government. But there was opposition to the *Tribune's* program. Contraction of the currency

bears hard on debtors; a large proportion of the people wished the number of greenbacks increased and more were afraid of speedy deflation. At the close of 1868, Greeley was engaged in a spirited debate with Senator Morton who urged gradual resumption of gold payments. Greeley stressed the fundamental soundness of his project in vivid analogy:

Immediate Resumption is a cold bath which instantly chills, but speedily invigorates; Gradual Resumption is a palsy which benumbs and paralyzes.

Closely connected with the subject of currency was the bonded indebtedness of the nation. The *Tribune* maintained that the tremendous drain of high interest (5% and 6%) on these war-time loans was depressing the greenbacks. Refund, said Greeley. Buy as many bonds as possible, refund the rest at 4% in an issue running 30–100 years. But pay principal and interest in gold, since the public faith was thus engaged.

Refund and Resume were the *Tribune's* words on the financial state of the country, but it also demanded Reform—in administration. The civil service was in a shocking state, especially that portion which was occupied in the collection of revenue. The *Tribune* asserted bluntly:

It is conceded that many if not most, of the subordinate officers through whom these duties are performed are corrupt, negligent or incompetent.

Executive strength was demanded for the purpose of correcting this evil, and wise choice of officials. More, sturdy leadership in the direction of honesty in government was necessary to set an example to a perverted legislature. The Pacific Railroad was completed, but suspicion was rife as to the method of its construction. Nearly four years was to elapse before the shameful truth would out, yet even in 1869, the *Tribune* spoke of rumors to the effect that

. . . Congress has been voting away empires of the richest lands on the earth to greedy speculators, and the wise and necessary enterprise of a railway to the Pacific has been made to cover the most shameless legislation that ever disgraced Congress.

Such was the state of the Union when the taciturn soldier took command. His first official act was a blunder, and exposed his limitations both in the judging of men and in knowledge of practical politics. Though Greeley applauded, the country was taken aback by Grant's Cabinet. The editor wired his paper from Washington that "Each man was chosen by Gen. Grant expressly to aid him in carrying out the programme of economy and integrity embodied in the inaugural," but men like Henry Adams were disturbed by the sight of this giant in war floundering among the intricacies of peacetime administration, surrounding himself with such men as Elihu Washburne, Rawlins, his aide-de-camp and unversed in affairs (probably his best choice, at that), A. T. Stewart, legally ineligible for the post to which he had been called, and A. E. Borie—totally unknown to fame. It was a poor beginning.

Hard on the heels of this initial error followed an episode which further aroused suspicion. As the *Tribune* was actively concerned, the incident deserves a special place in the paper's history. To facilitate the purchase of gold for payment of customs duties and the purpose of foreign trade, a separate trading organization had been set up in the Stock Exchange, known as the Gold Room, and speculation in that commodity naturally followed. In the beginning of September, 1869, heavy trading in gold began, and the price started to rise—slowly. By September 14, it was quoted at 135 $\frac{7}{8}$, an increase of about two points since the beginning of the month. On that day the *Tribune* advocated a check on gambling in the precious metal, by recalling gold certificates and by selling from the government gold reserve whenever the price rose. If the government was afraid of contraction, the *Tribune* further advised the retirement of bonds with the profits.

On September 15, a further rise in the price of gold was noted, and the *Tribune* flatly charged that "certain financiers of our city, in combination with European capitalists, have conspired to buy and withdraw from use Thirty Millions of Gold, with intent to compel those who must pay gold at the Custom-House or elsewhere to buy of them at exorbitant rates." To prevent this it was the "plain and imperative duty" of George S. Boutwell, the Secre-

tary of the Treasury, to sell the gold at his disposal, and break the price.

A week later, the Secretary had failed to act and gold was selling at 141½. The *Tribune* took a sharper tone. On the 24th, it named James Fisk and Jay Gould as the conspirators, and alternately begged and insisted on the sale of Treasury gold. Importers could not pay the duties on cargoes from abroad, foreign trade was suffering. Bankers were offering bills at 105½% and merchants' bills were unsalable at any price. Forced selling drove the Stock Exchange list down at dizzy speed, and, in the Gold Room, traders "stamped, raved and yelled."

As men read this account, on Friday, September 24, the crash came. When the market opened, gold leaped to 150, an advance of 8 points over the previous close. Then it rose to 162 as contracts piled up with Fisk and Gould. The market was cornered and the harrowed shorts compromised at 150. Suddenly came the word from Washington that Boutwell would sell gold and buy bonds—next day. Abruptly the bottom fell out of the corner, gold shot down to 135, and, as Thomas Nast pictured the episode, the great clock in Trinity Church gazed in awe at the monumental wreckage of Black Friday.

The *Tribune's* advice had been followed, but too late to avoid a serious panic and without profit to the government. Why, queried an editorial, did Boutwell only threaten to sell gold? Why didn't he sell it without warning? As it was, the gamblers were the only gainers. There were rumors, too, that General Grant was involved. He had been Fisk's guest, and the plunger implicated the President's brother-in-law. The *Tribune* was mildly jocular about "our wife's relations" and absolved Grant—had he not smashed the ring? But the aureate episode left a cloud, and the paper's defense lacked some of its usual vigor.

The clerks in Wall Street had barely disentangled the complicated accounts of Black Friday when the man in the White House precipitated another incident, not vitally important in itself, but which gives an index to the drift of Greeley and Reid away from Grant. In his message to Congress in December, 1869, the President recommended the annexation of San Domingo.

The reactions of the *Tribune* to this stroke of diplomacy were complex. The paper retained some of the abolitionist dislike to imperialism which had arisen from such slaveholding ventures in expansion as the Mexican War and the Ostend Manifesto. This spirit was indicated when Seward, in 1867, promoted the purchase of Alaska. The paper attacked that proposition, not only because the territory seemed valueless, but because the example of England seemed to prove the fallacy of a colonial system in general. "But why," asked an editorial, "should a republic purchase colonies? Why should she pay money to other people for living under her sway?" And when, in the early part of 1869, a resolution to extend a protectorate over Haiti and San Domingo was tabled by Congress, the *Tribune* expressed satisfaction.

John Russell Young, however, favored annexation. He saluted Grant's inaugural with an expression of hope for a "splendid administration," and the acquisition of Cuba, Porto Rico, Haiti and San Domingo, with Canada in prospect. Greeley was also a convert to the theory of Manifest Destiny, but when Whitelaw Reid succeeded Young, he introduced a note of caution. Reid was not yet an imperialist, and Charles Sumner, whom he admired, was opposed to the treaty of annexation almost from its inception.

When the treaty was first presented for consideration, the *Tribune* investigated the state of affairs on the island and brought back an inconclusive report. Opposition was based on the possibility of a revolt of the natives against an American seizure; uncertainty as to the amount of the debt which this country would acquire with the territory; the manner in which the treaty had been made with Baez, the President of San Domingo, and finally on personal loyalty to Sumner, the outstanding opponent as against Grant, the great protagonist of the treaty. The *Tribune* correspondents at Washington and on the island presented evidence to indicate that the inhabitants were at least divided on the question of annexation, with a strong probability that the rural population were opposed to Baez and would resent the Northern incursion with rifle and machete. Editorially, the *Tribune* advised caution.

In time to come the nation may have cause to approve more highly than now the acquisitive and business-like statesmanship of Gen. Grant in the matter of tropical estate. For the present, our national steps in

that direction are necessarily uncertain, however sure the end may be, and we cannot omit a wish for very slow movement toward San Domingo.

The Senate, under the leadership of Charles Sumner, rejected the treaty. Almost immediately Grant removed Sumner's friend, the historian Motley, from his position as Minister to Great Britain. The issue now became more than ever a personal conflict between the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the President. In his message of December, 1870, Grant again adverted to the desirability of annexation, and Sumner replied with a bitter speech that provoked retaliation from the united forces of the Administration.

Congress, apparently moved by a desire to compromise, decided to send a commission to investigate affairs on the island. Greeley said in one of his little notes to his assistant:

I send a letter from Hayti about San Domingo matters from my old friend and correspondent, whose name you probably know. She is a San Domingoite, as I partly am and you are not; but she knows what she writes, and her letter is worth the space it will take. Do not bear hard against San Domingo, for I believe its acceptance is Manifest Destiny, and will ultimately be popular.²

Reid, therefore, in spite of his indignation at the treatment of Sumner, was constrained to approve the commission. After conference with his chief, he penned an editorial which supported the Administration measure, but also defended Sumner against his enemies in the Senate.

The aftermath of the Congressional wrangle over the Commission bill was surprising and painful. The Administration Senators in caucus removed Sumner from his Chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Editorially, the *Tribune* was restrained in its condemnation. It asserted that the ouster was "a mistake," but devoted most of the article to a eulogy of the Massachusetts Senator, saying that his importance sprang not from his official position, but from his presence in the legislature; that even as member of the Committees on Enrolled Bills he would be great. The Washington correspondent was more explicit. Sumner's removal, he wrote, was "a gross political blunder." He quoted

Congressmen to the effect that Grant could not be nominated since this latest exhibition of petulance, or, if nominated, the party would be wrecked at the election. And in private, Greeley, no friend of Sumner, agreed.³

Still, the Grant regime was following a general policy in consonance with Greeley's ideas. Boutwell steadily reduced the national debt; not, perhaps, as speedily as the *Tribune* wished but the paper found little to blame in that quarter. The Administration maintained the tariff level, against the mounting protests of reformers. The Treaty of Washington was a fine piece of diplomacy. And in the South—but that is a story of even greater complexity than the San Domingo business.

The masked fraction of the Southern population which the *Tribune* had noted in January of 1869, began to assume more impressive proportions as the year advanced. In 1870, the carpetbag government of North Carolina was seriously alarmed, martial law was declared and the writ of habeas corpus suspended. The natural predisposition of the *Tribune* was to credit the reports of Ku-Klux activities and support coercive measures. It is, therefore, a significant sign of a growing realism that the paper made a careful, independent investigation of the subject.

A correspondent was sent to the state and his report is in refreshing contrast to the uncritical diatribes which the paper furnished to its readers in the early '60's. The natives were found to be taciturn and suspicious. The correspondent collected some evidence from politicians, but cautiously indicated their possible bias. His strongest witness was Judge Pearson who had been on the North Carolina bench for thirty-five years, and had received the nomination from both Republicans and Democrats in the last election. Pearson asserted that the Klan was a reality and that civil justice was unable to cope with the situation. On the basis of this report, the *Tribune* approved the measures adopted by Governor Holden, but condemned the flamboyant reports of atrocities which the Radicals were issuing from the state.

When Congress met again in December, 1870, the agitation over Klan activities began in the legislature. An investigation was made, proving to the *Tribune* at least that the hooded riders were Democrats seeking to gain power by force. The passage of the

"Ku-Klux" Acts was hailed as wise and necessary, harmful to none but evildoers. March and April, 1871, were months of rampant Radicalism in the paper's editorial page.

But in May, there was a reaction. Grant had officially proclaimed that conditions in South Carolina were intolerable, and threatened the use of Federal troops. Again the *Tribune* dispatched a correspondent to the scene, and he sent back an account which justified the Presidential expression, but in quite a different sense than Grant intended. Armed with instructions from Whitelaw Reid to obtain "an accurate statement of the exact political status of the South without the slightest reference to its political effect," the "special" returned a story of the negro regime which set the Radicals in an uproar. The freedmen, said this account, were mostly "ignorant, superstitious, semi-barbarous." Yet, "upon these people not only political rights have been conferred but they have absolute supremacy. They are the governing class in South Carolina, and a class more totally unfit to govern does not exist upon the face of the earth." Fraud ran riot at every election, and the negro militia was a terror to both whites and blacks. It was conditions such as these that made "almost every white man in the state" a member of the Klan.

The appearance of this report in the *Tribune* made a great sensation. The paper continued to attack the Klan, but there was a notable change in tone. And when, shortly after, Greeley accepted an invitation to address an audience in Texas, his speeches in the South laid the blame for the misfortunes of that section to Radical misrule as well as to Confederate intransigency. Greeley and the *Tribune* were stretching a tentative hand across the bloody chasm, and in the process they left the Grant Administration on the Northern bank.

Such was the gradual divergence of the *Tribune* from the dominant faction of the Republicans in policy. But on questions of administrative detail and party control the breach was already gaping when the San Domingo matter reached its crisis and before Greeley abandoned the Radical position on Southern affairs. It arose over Grant's ineptitude in political management and the bluntness of his moral perceptions in the choice of officials—in a word, over the breakdown of the Civil Service under his ad-

ministration. One chain of events may be taken to illustrate the progressive enlightenment of the *Tribune* management as to Grant's total failure as an executive.

In July of 1870, Grant appointed Thomas Murphy to the office of Collector of the Port of New York, the most important Federal post in the state and one of the most lucrative in the whole national service. The appointment was bad in itself. Murphy had a somewhat damaged career as a government contractor behind him and, as the sequel was to show, was completely unfit to manage the post. But the political significance of the appointment was even more important, insofar as Greeley and the *Tribune* were concerned. As the editor said later, "it was a plain declaration of war."

The New York State Republican machine was divided. The schism dated back to Greeley's dissolution of the firm of Seward, Weed and Greeley, and the subsequent warfare between Radicals and Conservatives in the Lincoln and Johnson Administrations. As Seward and Weed drifted into the position of elder statesmen, Henry J. Raymond took over the active management of the Conservative faction, only to die discredited in 1869, leaving a weakened and disorganized remnant to face the triumphant Radicals.

The latter were under the leadership of Greeley and Reuben Fenton, a mediocre politician with great suavity of manner but a not impeccable record. After serving as Governor, Fenton was sent by the legislature to the Senate. His election was hotly contested by the Conservatives, who charged him with accepting bribes. Fenton was not the *Tribune's* candidate for the office, but the paper spoke very highly of his record and denounced the "scurrilous diatribes" of the opposition.

In the Senate, Fenton's senior colleague from the state was Roscoe Conkling, an able and florid orator, highly conceited and no statesman, but an astute partizan leader. Conkling set about gathering the Conservative forces under his banner and undermining Fenton's position as boss of the state. Organization depends largely on patronage, dispensed by the President. As the Senate refused to confirm nomination to an office in any state whose representative opposed the appointment, the post of Senator was an important one in the machine scheme. With both of the New

York Senators heading opposing factions, Grant had it in his power to decide which should be the acknowledged representative of the national administration.

In appointing Murphy over the protest of Fenton and the *Tribune*, the President decided in favor of Conkling and the Conservatives. Murphy was a member of the Seward-Weed city organization, the "old Twenty-Third Street gang," and he was one of the leaders in the attempt to convict Fenton of bribe-taking. His nomination as Collector was thus as obnoxious to the Fentonites as could well be.

Murphy in the Customhouse was more than a testimony of the President's disapproval of Greeley's faction; he was a positive source of strength to the opposition. In his hands was the disposal of many of the state's minor offices, his appointees were prominent in convention. And when the New York Republicans assembled to nominate a governor in the September after Grant's decision, its evil effects were soon apparent. Greeley was an outstanding candidate for the chief office of the state. He publicly advised the convention against choosing him, feeling that it would weaken the ticket, but he could not forbear qualifying his disclaimer with the wistful remark that he would "feel grateful if the convention should deliberately adjudge him the strongest candidate." Instead, the state Republicans chose Stewart L. Woodford, a Conkling man.

The *Tribune* loyally rallied to Woodford's support, but rumors ran that Greeley was incensed at Grant's interference in state politics and that he was barely restrained from an open attack on the President. The editor denounced this as a "silly fabrication," but Grant was himself alarmed at the political bearings of his action. He wrote anxiously to John Russell Young, at that time editor of the *New York Standard*, that he had every confidence in Greeley as "an honest, firm, untiring supporter of the Republican party," whom he would like to conciliate. Perhaps an invitation to dinner? But that would be misunderstood. Greeley's faction was too intolerant.⁴ And so the great editor was left to muse on his offended dignity; the tact with which Lincoln tempered the *Tribune's* opposition was wanting in the Soldier President.

Conkling proceeded to consolidate the position he had won.

After the election of 1870, his state organization moved on Greeley's stronghold, the city General Committee, with intent to reorganize—in the interests of Conkling. The excuse given was that Democrats were on the Republican district lists. Greeley as chairman, offered to submit to reorganization, but his fellow members declined and the contest was carried to the State Convention. Here Conkling asserted himself. With a solid phalanx of Customhouse men behind him, the new head of the state's Republicans refused all compromise and rode roughshod over the Fentonites. It was a complete victory for Grant, Conkling and Tom Murphy.

A breach between Greeley and the Conkling machine was imminent, but it was postponed by the exposure of Tammany corruption. The incubus of the Ring had been fastened on the city for many years; its influence was powerful, even dominant at Albany, and the *Tribune* was willing to waive its grievances in the interest of a united party to capitalize the effects of the *Times'* coup. "We accept the ticket yesterday nominated at Syracuse," said the leader of September 29; and the burden of the *Tribune's* song in the campaign which followed was Harmony. "The Administration *must* carry this election," "We must Harmonize, Down with the Ring!"

The concord imposed by a common foe could be only temporary. The *Tribune* and its editor were faced by a serious dilemma—discontent at various features of the Administration's policy had been bitterly intensified by the President's tactless treatment of the New York political situation, but what was the editor of a Republican newspaper to do? Greeley believed in the party system, believed in honest partizanship. "That what styles itself an 'independent' journal is inevitably a fraud," said the *Tribune* on January 3, 1871; the paper's relation to politics was close and clearly defined:

The proper attitude of a journalist, like that of any other citizen, is that which allows him most freedom to act as his convictions may dictate; and that is precisely the attitude we hold in conducting the *Tribune*. We act with that party which we deem right in the main, because we thus give effect to our personal convictions. And one of our most imperative duties, to that party as well as to the country, constrains

us to expose and resist any wrong which is sought to be perpetrated under its shield by the abuse of its influence and good name.

The *Tribune's* course during most of the Grant Administration was along the lines thus laid down, but the President's conduct made the role of benevolent critic increasingly difficult to sustain. It was possible, in that character, to attack Conkling, to pillory his vanity in the title "Pet of the Petticoats." It was also in order to pour hot shot into Tom Murphy, Grant's appointee and Conkling's lieutenant; to accuse him of selling "blotting paper" caps and hats made of "ground shoddy and shellac" to the government and to make a searching investigation into his maladministration of the Customhouse. But to attack the President, the titular head of the party, was emphatically on a different plane.

Greeley was under pressure to bring the *Tribune* into open war on Grant. When Creswell, the Postmaster General, moved to reopen the Chorpensing Claim, which Congress had almost unanimously rejected as a fraud, indignant statesmen endeavored to enlist Greeley in the fight.⁵ Moreover, many of the best Republican papers in the country were early in revolt, and they badgered the *Tribune* for its rather inglorious loyalty. The *Chicago Tribune*, the *Cincinnati Commercial*, the *Nation*, the *Springfield Republican*—a goodly band of rebels—were a reproach to Greeley's acquiescence.

The first overt act on the *Tribune's* part came on May 6, 1871. Commenting on an editorial in the *Springfield Republican* which referred to the *Tribune's* "hesitating, concealed unfriendliness" to Grant, Greeley replied that his personal views had been freely aired in conversation, but that he had hoped to postpone a public pronouncement on the issue until the winter. "It is certainly true," he went on, "that we are not seeking the reelection of Gen. Grant as President." While in general accord with the major policies of the Administration, the editor did not approve of running Grant "or any other man for President while he wields the patronage of that high office." In other words, Greeley was reverting to his One-Term principle, enunciated in 1864.

The state of the nation did not permit even this passive disapproval. Scandal thickened about the Administration. Fraudulent

claims in Congress, flagrant abuse of the patronage—a sickening moral miasma arose from Washington which would be enough to provoke even a New York City electorate to rebellion. The *Tribune* had the thankless task of exposing corruption without reflecting too severely on the honest, dull-witted author of it all. When Casey, Collector of the Port of New Orleans, duplicated in Louisiana the tactics of Murphy in New York, the paper called on Grant to dismiss the men who “abused his confidence.” They were all “abusing the confidence” or “betraying the trust” of the Soldier President—and the sum of these infractions inevitably led to the conclusion that the General, however unconsciously, was serving the people after the same fashion.

The final touch to the unpleasant picture presented by the Civil Service was added by Grant in November of 1871. Public clamor against Collector Murphy was steadily growing in volume, led by the *Tribune*. When that delectable individual took over the New York Customhouse, he inherited a bad system. Moses Grinnell, his predecessor, had been visited by a former member of Grant's staff, Colonel Leet, who bore a letter of recommendation, couched in general terms from his old commander. Grinnell took this as a *carte blanche* from the President, and on the suggestion of Leet and his partner, Stocking, issued a ruling which caused consternation among the shippers and merchants of the city.

According to the regulations of the Treasury Department, importers were allowed a certain time to discharge their consignments from ships arriving in port. At the expiration of this period, the unclaimed cargo was deposited by a “general order” into warehouses under Federal control. The large shipping firms had found it convenient to build their own warehouses, near their docks, which were placed under the supervision of Customs officials. This worked well, was convenient for the importers and carried out the intent of the law.

Grinnell's ruling required that all “general order” goods be placed in the warehouses of Leet, Stocking and Co., in New York City. This made it necessary for shippers to cart the consignments from docks in Brooklyn, Jersey City, Hoboken or wherever, to the city stores, and gave Leet's firm a monopoly of the storage. It was inconvenient and expensive to the importers; the mo-

nopolists raised rates and assessed a minimum of one month's storage, whether the goods were kept thirty days or forty-eight hours. Merchants protested, western firms had goods shipped through Montreal to avoid the New York exactions. Murphy sustained the system in its full vigor, although Secretary Boutwell recommended that it be abolished.

In November, Murphy lost courage. The *Tribune's* revelations were making his position uncomfortable, and a session of Congress with an inevitable investigation loomed ahead. He resigned. But what might have been the elimination of a serious handicap to the Administration was converted, by Grant's obstinate loyalty, into a positive disaster. In accepting Murphy's resignation, the President expressed his "unqualified confidence" in the discredited official, and thanked him for "the efficiency, honesty and zeal" of his administration. This was the crowning evidence of Grant's unfitness for his high office. "He stood by his friends"—but his friends had no place in an honest government.

The issue was now squarely before Greeley. The Grant forces, Zachariah Chandler, Ben Butler, Conkling, Morton and their like, backed by a veritable "Praetorian Guard" of Federal office-holders, were almost certain to capture the Republican National Convention for their leader. To join this crew, to acquiesce in the renomination of Grant in the face of the personal indignity which had been heaped upon the *Tribune's* editor and the national shame he witnessed all about, was to put an impossible strain on the bonds of party loyalty. To support a Democratic nominee was almost equally distasteful for one of Greeley's antecedents. True, the party under the leadership of Vallandigham and Watterson was moving toward a "New Departure," an acceptance of the issues of the war, and Samuel Tilden was cauterizing the plague spots of Tammany. But the scars of a long and bitter fight are not easily healed; Greeley had given and received many a sturdy blow in his warfare with the "Sham-Democracy."

There was another alternative. In Missouri, there had been a successful revolt against the regular Republican organization. The constitution of that state, as revised after the war, provided for the disfranchisement of those who participated in rebellion—no inconsiderable number in the No Man's Land of the border. A

reaction soon set in, and in 1870 the legislature submitted a constitutional amendment to the people which removed the disabilities of 1865. In the State Republican Convention, the friends of Universal Amnesty endeavored to insert a plank in the party platform favoring the amendment, only to be defeated by the Old Guard. Whereupon they seceded from the Convention, led by Carl Schurz and B. Gratz Brown. Adopting the name of Liberal Republicans, the bolters ran Brown for governor, and, with Democratic support, swept the state.

Grant opposed the bolt as tending to weaken the party, and the *Tribune* was also hostile. Since the constitutional amendment would be submitted to the people at all events, Greeley felt that the Liberals were really endeavoring to secure Free Trade, a proceeding which he naturally disapproved. There was indeed a strong Revenue Reform element among the Liberal Republicans, and in 1871 the Central Committee of that organization presented a resolution calling for a State Liberal Convention and favoring tariff reduction, reform of the civil service and the removal of all political disabilities.

This was a program which had a national appeal. By the end of 1871, Republican disaffection had reached a high point. Not only were political leaders of the old Radical stamp, men like Charles Sumner, Lyman Trumbull, Carl Schurz and George W. Julian, in arms against the Administration, but an impressive array of editors were similarly aligned. Naturally, the Democratic publicists, Watterson of the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and Mantou Marble of the *World*, fought for their side. But the best Republican journalists were also either very discontented or in open mutiny. Horace White and his *Chicago Tribune*, Murat Halstead of the *Cincinnati Commercial* and Samuel Bowles of the *Springfield Republican* had been of the opposition almost from the beginning of Grant's term. Charles A. Dana began the year 1872 in the *Sun* with a demand for a national ticket composed of Lyman Trumbull and Samuel Tilden. Lawrence Godkin, the brilliant Irish editor of the *Nation*, and William Cullen Bryant, the poetical head of the *Evening Post*, were in a mood to be receptive to the advances of the Missouri Liberals. The finest representatives of the press of the day were ready for combat.

But the Achilles of the host hesitated. In the first place, a war with the party in power meant danger to the *Tribune*. How would the paper's circulation and revenue react to a bolt from the party around which so much of recent history, past fears and future hopes seemed centered? Greeley was master of the *Tribune's* fate, but the responsibility for the material welfare of hundreds of employees and many stockholders rested on his decision. The editor's stake in the journal he had founded was steadily shrinking. Only six of the hundred shares were his own, and among the twenty-two who shared the ownership of the establishment with him were relatives, old employees, widows and orphans. To some, the *Tribune's* dividends meant all their provision for life. In November, 1871, Greeley thus explained his perplexity:

But here am I at the head of a newspaper which is a great property, which others mainly own. If it were all mine I might not mind the risk; but it belongs to others, and it must be seriously damaged by the course I am inclined to take. Moreover if I take that course, I shall be widely believed to have thus sacrificed others' property to my own personal resentment,—perhaps to my own ambition.⁶

Another obstacle which hindered Greeley from joining the Liberal movement was the prevailing Free Trade sentiment of his potential allies. How could the *Tribune* support a cause which it felt would infallibly result in economic disaster? The paper asserted flatly

. . . that the overthrow of our protective system would be immediately followed by enormous importations of foreign manufactures and their sale at low prices; that this would cause a glut in our markets, and a stoppage through bankruptcy of many, if not most of our manufacturing establishments; that this would be followed in turn by a general advance of prices on the part of the foreign producers and exporters who had thus obtained control of our markets.

On January 24, 1872, the Liberal Republican Convention met at Jefferson City, Missouri, and issued a call for a national convention to be held at Cincinnati in May. On January 29, Greeley discussed the proceedings in a long editorial. After referring sympathetically to the efforts of the Liberals to secure fair treatment for the South and to reform the civil service, the editorial continued:

"Then the *Tribune* is going with the Bolters?"

No; the *Tribune* is likely to be against the Bolters, since they are almost certain to make hostility to Protection one of the planks of their platform, and *that* the *Tribune* can never abide, no matter who may be the rival candidates for President. Now that Emancipation is a fixed fact, Impartial Suffrage nearly so, and Universal Amnesty inevitable, there is no remaining issue which is half so important in the view of the *Tribune* as that of protection vs. Free Trade.

But, while acknowledging this great gulf fixed, the editorial ended on a warning note to the regulars:

Men and brethren! a new leaf must be turned over or there are breakers ahead. The proposed Cincinnati Convention may prove a fiasco, or it may name the next President. If you desire the latter you will pray that Roscoe Conkling and Co. shall have the running of the Grant machine for a few months longer.

CHAPTER VI

DIES IRAE

THE time of decision arrived in March, when the call for the regular Republican Convention was to be sent out, which Greeley, as member of the National Committee, must sign. His absence from the sessions of that committee in January had already provoked comment, for the organization had adopted resolutions strongly inimical to Civil Service Reform. Now the day had come to stand up and be counted. Greeley made his choice. To Beman Brockway, then editor of the *Watertown Reformer*, he wrote on March 13:

I feel like fighting. I shall favor the Cincinnati Convention, and am inclined to support its candidate unless this should require me to oppose Protection to Home Industry. That I can't go, even though it would make me President.

We shall probably suffer in this fight. If I owned the *Tribune*, I wouldn't mind that. But I have had as much Grant as I can endure.¹

On March 30, Greeley signed a letter from the New York Liberals, adhering to the Jefferson City platform—with reservations on the *Tribune's* part as to the tariff plank. And Whitelaw Reid went to Cincinnati in May to watch over the interests of his chief.

The Liberal Republican Convention of 1872 had many aspects of comedy. Loosely organized, it had no precedent for settling the claims of contesting delegations. The delegates themselves represented all types of political thought, discontented stragglers from the great parties, sincere reformers and the lunatic fringe which is attracted to every new standard. The Republicans claimed that their only common cause was "anything to beat Grant," and "Marse Henry" Watterson in retrospect admitted that "coherence was a missing ingredient."²

Yet there was a "lift" in the atmosphere at Cincinnati, a consciousness of high purpose, the fellowship of a crusade against unrighteousness. The *Tribune* correspondent remarked that the

gathering resembled the convention at Chicago which nominated Lincoln; there was a similar feeling of impending drama, and many of the same faces were in evidence.

Whitelaw Reid had two tasks. He must secure a workable compromise on the tariff and promote the candidacy of Horace Greeley. The first proved relatively easy. Greeley in New York was demanding a definitive statement on the question, writing editorials such as that of May 1:

We have only urged the Convention to use language that unequivocally expresses its meaning; if that meaning be free trade, let there be no mistake and no dispute about it.

But the Revenue Reformers were not disposed to be inflexible on the subject. As Horace White said, the pacification of the South was "the 'house-on-fire,' it must be put out at once."³ Other things could wait. Reid telegraphed word of this accommodating frame of mind, and on May 3, *Tribune* subscribers were probably somewhat surprised to read:

We have steadfastly insisted that the liberty to differ on this question, hitherto exercised by Republicans, shall not be denied to those who sympathize with the liberal movement. . . .

We are not of one mind on this question, then why not say just that?

On the same morning, the Liberal Convention said "just that." A platform was adopted including a plank "recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade" and remitting "the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts and to the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation." This ingenious and rather sensible solution, prefiguring Hancock's famous "local issue," smoothed out the roughest spot in Greeley's road to Cincinnati.

Whitelaw Reid's second task was far more difficult. Greeley's candidacy had been suggested as far back as June, 1871, by Theodore Tilton, in his magazine, the *Golden Age*. The New York Liberal delegation was solid for the editor, although a group of Revenue Reformers, including Henry Demarest Lloyd, contested the seats. But it is symptomatic of the mistrust evoked by the

editor's erratic course that none of the guiding spirits of the Convention seriously considered Greeley as a potential nominee, but thought that his strength would be dissipated after a good complimentary vote.⁴

The guiding spirits aforesaid were four renowned editors. As so much of the impetus of the Republican secession had come from the press, it was inevitable that it should be heavily represented. In fact, one observer thought the convention resembled "an annual meeting of the Associated Press."⁵ Sam. Bowles, Horace White, Murat Halstead and Henry Watterson comprised the leaders; together they formed an offensive and defensive alliance known as the Quadrilateral, after the famous Austrian military position in Northern Italy. Carl Schurz, the Chairman of the Convention, was in complete harmony with the newspaper combine.

The Quadrilateral had decided to limit the field of candidates to Lyman Trumbull, represented by Horace White, and Charles Francis Adams, Bowles's choice. After some little urging, Greeley was included and Reid joined the group. The first manifestation of joint power was the destruction, by a simultaneous editorial blast from five newspapers, of a movement to nominate Judge David Davis—regarded by the faintly "unco' guid" of the Quadrilateral as representing the place-hunters.

Adams was felt to be the most promising candidate. He had the sturdy, almost contemptuous, integrity of his line, he had served the Union with conspicuous success as Minister to England during the war, and it was believed that he had the best chance of attracting the Democratic vote. But the candidate would do nothing to further his own chances, and his supporters showed themselves exceedingly inept in convention management. On the other hand, the Davis managers were disgruntled by the tactics of the Quadrilateral and certain skillful politicians from Missouri were disposed to work against Adams. B. Gratz Brown was apparently resentful of Schurz's rising prestige, and Frank Blair had a family feud to wage with the grandson of John Quincy Adams. Moreover, the Greeley forces were adroitly handled by the canny Reid, enthusiastic Theodore Tilton and the sagacious William Dorshimer.

The upshot of it all was a sad surprise for the Adams workers. After the first ballot, Brown threw his strength to Greeley. There was some pulling and hauling, during which the Illinois delegation voted steadfastly for Trumbull and Davis—21 votes for each. Apparently it was like the Alabama vote in the Democratic Convention of 1924; the reiteration excited the mirth of the assemblage, but became "just a trifle tiresome." At any rate, at the sixth ballot, Illinois withdrew to confer. The Greeley men started a stampede, and when the Illinois vote showed a gain for their candidate, the uproar grew. Other delegations, catching the enthusiasm, changed their votes and the tumult became overwhelming. Schurz, the Chairman, "gave up in despair and let Babel reign unmolested," while the Greeley majority piled up. Finally Schurz, summoned from the floor, announced the result. It was Greeley, 482 and Adams, 187. A call for a unanimous vote was promptly negated. The proceedings of the Liberal Convention closed with the nomination of B. Gratz Brown for the Vice-Presidency.

The Quadrilateral were disgusted. They stuck by their agreement to support the candidate, but without any enthusiasm. Bowles wired his paper to support the ticket—but not to "gush." ⁶ White remained skittish throughout the campaign. Schurz, of but not in the fraternity, went off at score, tried to get Greeley to refuse the nomination and talked of a new ticket. It required much diplomacy to bring him back into line. Only Halstead and Watterson showed any cheerfulness at the result. They were, indeed, "reformers hoist by their own petard." ⁷

The surprise of the country at large surpassed that of the inner circle. The Republicans were jubilant; Thomas Nast caricatured the outcome in the fable of the mountain in labor at the birth of a mouse. Greeley's war record, his strong high-tariff line, his assaults on the "Sham-Democracy," his state political affiliations and his personal idiosyncrasies made him a shining target for every kind of attack. Democratic papers, like the *World*, shied violently; the *Nation*, half converted to the Liberal cause, swung back to Grant; and Bryant, one of the anti-Administration leaders, made a bitter attack on Greeley and passed into the regular ranks again.

Nevertheless, the Democrats, albeit hesitantly, accepted Greeley.

He, on the other hand, made some difficulty about accepting them. He knew what embarrassments would result from a formal nomination by the party he had so persistently assailed, and it was his hope that the Democrats would repeat their action of 1870 in Missouri; that is, hold no convention, but tacitly support the Liberal ticket.⁸ Later, the *Tribune* explained that Greeley regarded the action of the Democrats in nominating him as a "deplorable error" and only permitted it "on the judgment, perhaps mistaken of his near friends."

The *Tribune* was now committed to a delicate and dangerous undertaking. Greeley, pressed by Bowles and the rest, divested himself of the editorship, and Whitelaw Reid took over full charge of the journal. The new editor felt that the circumstances demanded a more dignified tone than had previously been employed in like contests. On May 9, he outlined his plan to Greeley:

With your permission I shall endeavor to keep the *Tribune* out of all newspaper controversies. This is the uniform policy of the *London Times*, and it seems to me that there is no better occasion for us to introduce it here. For myself I mean to make no reply to the dirty attacks of the *Times* upon me, or to the malignant onslaughts of the *Post* upon our position. If we are grossly misrepresented it is always possible to make a brief impersonal statement setting the matter right without naming the newspaper or provoking controversy. I feel sure that this is an indispensable feature of our policy for the campaign, and hope that in this judgment I may have your approval.⁹

This policy, with its corollary of avoiding personal attacks on the opposing candidate, was new in American journalism. Reid was ahead of his age, and was not wholly successful in his attempt to bring the *Tribune* to a higher plane. The attacks of the opposition were too gross to be borne with equanimity, for one thing, and even his own side misinterpreted the editor's motives, ascribing the paper's restraint to "lukewarmness."

For it was a bitterly personal campaign. The Republicans, of course, fought the war all over again. Greeley's invitation to the South to "clasp hands across the bloody chasm" of war and reconstruction was interpreted as an attempt to replace the rebels in the political saddle and undo all the work of the past twelve years. Weird stories appeared in the press of atrocities inflicted

upon Unionists by the Liberals. The *Times*, staunchly regular, printed a dispatch telling of an incident in Palmyra, Missouri, wherein a Confederate ensign was displayed at a Greeley meeting "to create the necessary enthusiasm." Loyal protests caused it to be replaced by the Stars and Stripes. The majority of the crowd cried out against this, and the Confederate banner was again raised. "The consequence was our great national colors were hauled down in obedience to the rebel supporters of Horace Greeley."

But if the Republican grand strategy was based on an appeal to Northern patriotism, its tactics centered largely on the personality of Horace Greeley. James M. Edmunds and Zachariah Chandler had formed a Congressional campaign committee to coördinate the work of Republicans and to secure "a uniform treatment of political subjects by newspapers and speakers throughout the country, and the circulation (under the franking privilege or otherwise) of instructive and timely documents."¹⁰ This organization was well financed and administered. It adopted the technique of the modern press agent, published a monthly magazine and distributed a "clip sheet" of interesting matter to newspapers everywhere.

Edmunds conceived the notion of searching the files of Greeley's newspaper "for the ample material therein contained which would make impossible his support by the Democratic masses." Thirty thousand dollars and the services of "upward of three hundred writers" were put into this task, with notable success.¹¹ Greeley's assertiveness made him fair game for this type of hunting, and his frequent self-contradictions were painstakingly set forth in a pamphlet called "The Greeley Record." The many ironies of this work tickled the facile humor of the electorate and sensibly weakened the Liberal cause. There was a sharp point to Nast's cartoon of Greeley wryly swallowing a bitter brew labeled "My Own Words And Deeds."

The case against the Republicans, as presented in the *Tribune*, was far sounder, but less emotional. The plea for the South was rather difficult for readers to understand, attuned as they were to Greeley's denunciation of the Ku-Klux Klan. The subtle shades of

the *Tribune's* policy on Reconstruction were lost in the din of the campaign; only the apparent contradictions stood out.

In its denunciation of the corruption of Grant's Administration the *Tribune* stood on more solid ground. To the sordid list of frauds already exposed, was added in September a new and gaudy shame, involving some of the chiefs of the regular organization. One Henry S. McComb brought suit in a Pennsylvania court to recover 25 shares of stock in a company known as the Credit Mobilier. This company had been formed of some of the principal stockholders of the Union Pacific Railroad, to construct the road. As directors of the railroad, the Credit Mobilier associates awarded themselves most profitable contracts and waxed fat. But Congress had supplied the sinews for the Pacific Railroad, and the public grew restive. To forestall inquisitiveness, Oakes Ames, a leader in the swindle and a Congressman, distributed shares in the company to many legislators, permitting payment from the huge, rapidly accruing dividends.

This was the shameful story revealed by the McComb suit. The *Sun* on September 4, blazoned its revelations with the heading

THE KING OF FRAUDS
How the Credit Mobilier Bought
Its Way Through Congress

Beneath was an exposition of Ames's legislative methods, and under a separate headline, wailing "Oh, My Country!" was his list of gratuities

	shares
Blaine of Maine	3,000
Patterson of New Hampshire	3,000
Wilson, of Massachusetts	2,000
Painter (Rep.) for Quigley	2,000
S. Colfax, Speaker	2,000
Scofield and Kelley, Pa.	2,000 (each)
Eliot, Massachusetts	3,000
Dawes, Massachusetts	2,000
Fowler, Tennessee	2,000
Boutwell, Massachusetts	2,000
Bingham and Garfield, O.	2,000 (each)
Endorsed; Oakes Ames, Jan. 31, 1868.	

The "emotion of profound and painful astonishment" which this revelation excited may be readily imagined. Reid followed it by an even more sensational item in the *Tribune*. On September 28, the paper published a list similar to Ames's, of stock in the Leavenworth, Pawnee and Western Railroad furnished for the purpose of securing "the ratification of the Delaware and Pottawatomie treaties and the passage of the Pacific Railway Bill." In this list, "Blaine of Maine" was recorded as receiving two lots of scrip to a total value of nearly two million dollars.

In the final reckoning, James G. Blaine escaped from both of these damaging attacks. He had wisely returned the Credit Mobilier stock, and the *Tribune* charge was never substantiated, though the paper assured the accuracy of its list by printing a facsimile and securing the attestation of the road's attorney. It developed that John E. Blaine, a brother of the Congressman, had once owned some stock—that was the foundation of the story.¹² But it is a miracle that the charges of the *Sun* and the *Tribune* did not have a greater effect on the campaign.

For it was going badly. At the first, Greeley was delighted and hopeful. Surprised by his nomination, he had smiled as he dispatched his message of thanks. The movement, despite the disaffection of many leaders, gained ground in the beginning and the candidate confidently invited friends to attend his inaugural.¹³ But even in July, when the Liberal cause seemed brightest, there was a disturbing weakness in the party coffers. Workers clamored for subsidies; "a presidential campaign against a party in power cannot be fought successfully upon promises,"¹⁴ wrote an Ohio leader. Greeley began to feel the weight of "the money and the office-holding power."¹⁵

The Republicans had set up the cry that Greeley's election would unsettle business, and the bankers and business men as well as the officeholders were responding with sizable contributions. It was the first great "shake-down" campaign.

In a forlorn hope of stemming the tide, Greeley took the stump. His friends were nervous, they feared indiscretions, but the old editor surpassed himself. His speeches for reconciliation between North and South were described as "suffused with the healing spirit of magnanimous patriotism."¹⁶ Watterson said "If speech-

making ever does any good toward the shaping of results, Greeley's speeches should have elected him." ¹⁷ And as the crowds cheered, a ray of hope came to the discouraged Liberals. On October 4, Greeley wrote:

We were on the downhill road when I started for the West, now our friends are in light spirits and we seem to be gaining ground. Still the power of money is fearful. . . . If we have fair elections and a fair vote fairly counted, we shall come out ahead. ¹⁸

But the ray soon faded and black despair settled on the swift-aging warrior. The cares of the campaign had taken a terrific toll. The abuse from the country he had served so well was even more harrowing. Like a powerful engine in a weak hull, Greeley's mind and will were wracking his none too sturdy frame. Suspensions and fears, wild and feverish, tortured his imagination. The *Tribune*, his deepest love, was assailed. Not only were canceled subscriptions cutting into the once-proud circulation which was the crown of his life work, but partizan postmasters cunningly sent the *Times* to still-loyal readers. Many of his friends were alienated; he wondered if those who remained were really true.

To top his woes, Mrs. Greeley, long an invalid, passed into "the last stages of an incurable illness." Weary, the editor sat by her side, watching the painful and inevitable end, till the wish was wrenched from his tortured soul that "she were to be laid in her grave next week and I to follow her the week after." ¹⁹

Before this grief, politics receded. Greeley only longed for the end of the clamor that still raged about him. His wife died on October 30. Four days later, he wrote to his good friend, Mrs. Margaret Allen, in terms which touchingly reveal the extent of his suffering:

Very private
My Friend:

I am not dead, but wish I were. My house is desolate, my future dark, my heart a stone. I cannot shed tears; they would bring some relief. Shed tears for me but do not write again till a brighter day, which I fear will never come.

Yours
Horace Greeley.

Show this note to no one and destroy it. ²⁰

On the next day, the nation voted. Grant was reelected by a majority of 762,991. The Greeley campaign was over and, broken in mind and body, the editor returned to the *Tribune*.

The home-coming was a sad one, for Greeley and for his associates. He saw at close range the damage which his quixotic venture had caused the paper; they witnessed in him the ravages of grief and overwork. The anxious watches by his wife's bedside and the accumulating evils of the campaign had induced in the editor insomnia and a state of nervous irritability which made it impossible for him to work except for brief periods. In the intervals, he was tormented by suspicions and especially by self-reproach. He reiterated that he was a "black fraud," that he had ruined the paper, his friends and his personal estate; and, amid bursts of tears, he asserted to the stockholders that he deserved the penitentiary for his poor judgment.²¹

The situation of the paper was critical. A firm hand was needed to guide it into safe ground—but Greeley was unable to take the reins. An unfortunate incident occurred on the very day of his resumption of editorial control, which reveals the feverish state of the office in those dark days. On November 7, Greeley announced his official return to the paper in a card on the editorial page. It read:

The undersigned resumes the Editorship of the *Tribune* which he relinquished upon embarking in another line of business six months ago. Henceforth, it shall be his endeavor to make this a thoroughly independent journal treating all parties and political movements with judicial fairness and candor, but courting the favor and deprecating the wrath of no one.

Horace Greeley

November 7, 1872.

On the same page appeared an editorial from the pen of J. R. G. Hassard entitled "Crumbs of Comfort." It began with the statement that "There has been no time within the last twelve years, when the *Tribune* was not supposed to keep, for the benefit of the idle and incapable, a sort of Federal employment agency; established to get places under government for those who were indisposed to work for a living." Now that the editor no longer had "any credit with the appointing powers," continued Hassard, the

office would be free from the "blatherskites and political beggars," the "red-nosed politicians who had cheated at the caucus and fought at the polls." No longer would Greeley be summoned to Washington "to save this bill, to crush that one, to promote one project and to stop another. . . . At last we shall be let alone to mind our own affairs and manage our own newspaper without being called aside every hour to help lazy people whom we don't know and to spend our strength in efforts that only benefit people who don't deserve assistance."

With all its humorous exaggeration, this article revealed a state of affairs which was common knowledge. Greeley had been forced to abandon his office near the editorial rooms for a more retired spot on that very account.²² But Greeley was upset and his nerves were all askew. Hassard's squib could be taken as an insult to the Greeley following and as too firm a seal upon the editor's political grave. With the white light of the recent canvass still beating upon the *Tribune*, the incident attracted some attention. Greeley departed from his usual loyal acquiescence in the acts of his subordinates and scribbled a retraction:

By some unaccountable fatality, an article entitled "Crumbs of Comfort" crept into our last unseen by the editor, which does him the grossest wrong. It is true that office-seekers used to pester him for recommendations when his friends controlled the custom house, though the red-nosed variety was seldom found among them; it is not true that he ever obeyed a summons to Washington in order that he might there oppose this or that private scheme. In short, the article is a monstrous fable based on some other experience than that of any editor of this journal.²³

Whitelaw Reid was placed in an awkward situation by this internal brawl. The responsibilities and cares of the campaign had weighed heavily upon him; unkind contemporaries poked cruel fun at his "bent form, disheveled hair and frenzied look." He felt that his own tenure in office depended upon Greeley's life and favor, but the old editor was manifestly incapable of the continuous effort imposed by the necessities of the *Tribune's* position, and Greeley's retraction would doubtless lead to serious disaffection in the staff. In fact, in private, Reid asserted that it "would have sent every editor out of the staff."²⁴ Greeley's card was suppressed.

The editor accepted the situation, but the tension in the office was heightened. Greeley became more erratic, and the doctors took a serious view of his condition. His friends and the *Tribune* tried to allay the public curiosity, but the brightest flame in American journalism was flickering low. The conditions which the unhappy results of the "Forward to Richmond!" campaign had induced in 1861 was evidenced in an aggravated form. Inflammation of the lining of the brain set in, and Greeley was removed to the home of a physician near the Chappaqua farm, where he died on November 29, 1872.

This tragic climax to a picturesque career, satisfying all the canons of drama, wrought powerfully upon the emotions of the American people. The abuse, the mistrust, were forgotten and a flood of sympathy welled up which is unique in American newspaper history. The nation rejected Greeley politically, but his death revealed how closely the odd little figure of the Man in the White Hat had entwined itself in the very fabric of the national life. His phrases, his homespun actions, his very career were part of it. The hundreds of thousands who had admired or railed at him were now confronted by an unaccountable vacuum. Old Horace would no longer preach to the groups around the stove at the country store.

The press, which had envied his success, amused itself with his idiosyncrasies, and wrestled with his ideas, sensed the same lack. Those provocative initials at the foot of a pungent editorial—focal point of so many newspaper wars—would never sound the onset again. H. G. was gone to join Raymond and Bennett, and the survivors felt that an era had passed with him. So they joined with the people in a mighty tribute.

And the politicians were not absent. When, after reposing in state at the City Hall, the coffin of Greeley was borne in melancholy triumph down Broadway, his principal foes in the late campaign graced the cortege. Grant was there and the unctuous Schuyler Colfax (soon to be a candidate for the chair Greeley left vacant), Henry Wilson, Colfax's successor-elect in the Vice-Presidency, and Governor Hoffman of New York, the last remnant of Tweed's long ascendancy. Somewhat ironical yet somewhat touching, this procession, that gathered in the chill gray of early De-

cember, under the sable shadows of the mourning panels draped on the *Tribune* building. The recognition which the politicians had so long denied the living editor they granted in full measure at his death.

One discordant note disturbed the harmony of a unified grief. Charles A. Dana made his announcement of Greeley's passing the occasion of a cruel attack on Whitelaw Reid. Under the heading of "The Last Blow" he detailed the story of that unlucky "Crumbs of Comfort" editorial and asserted bluntly that the retraction was the cause of Greeley's death—"the blow which seems to have finally overthrown his reason was struck by his own assistant in the conduct of the *Tribune*, Mr. Whitelaw Reid."

The most astonishing feature of this charge is its vitality. It could be neither proved nor disproved—it depended wholly upon inference for its credibility, and at the time Reid wisely adhered to the policy laid down in the campaign of refusing to reply to personal attacks. He declined to enter such a controversy either in the *Tribune* or through interviews with representatives of other papers, preferring to permit the loyalty of Greeley's old friends and the good taste of the newspaper public to stand as his defense.

The immediate effects of this dignified policy were favorable to Greeley's First Assistant and successor. During the brisk interchange of personalities in the canvass, Reid had suffered. His meteoric rise to the proudest post in the press had inspired some to envy, a feeling which deepened to suspicion through the failure of many of his fellow journalists to pierce that veil of reserve which shrouded the tall Ohioan. In the lusty newspaper world of the time, dignity was resented and reserve was suspect. When to this fundamental misunderstanding was added the rancor of an intense political campaign, Reid's belief that he was "about the best-hated man in New York" in October, 1872,²⁵ had substantial justification.

The *Sun's* charge really cleared the air—for a time, at least. Coming as it did in the midst of a universal tribute of respect to a fallen leader, it was regarded as unworthy of the craft which that leader had embellished. Political foes of Reid, such as Hugh Hastings of the *Commercial Advertiser*, wrote personally to express

their disapprobation of Dana's recklessness,²⁶ and even the *Times*, a bitter opponent, was distressed at the "brawl over an open grave." The rest of the press were energetic in their disapproval, and the conventional expressions of sympathy to Greeley's associate took on a warmer note.

The unsavory episode might well have been buried with the *Tribune's* founder, but Dana carried on his feud with virulent persistence. In 1879, he published a facsimile of Greeley's suppressed retraction of the "Crumbs of Comfort" editorial, with a résumé of the whole affair. Reid's troubles with the Typographical Union led to the employment by the striking compositors of the hoary canard in their publication *The Boycotter*, and the story passed down through the years with intermittent life to a position in history which is far above its deserts. Perhaps its most amusing incarnation was in the columns of the *Sun*, where on November 18, 1884, the "Crumbs of Comfort" editorial was published under the heading

Horace Greeley's Last Words
The Manly Utterance of a Proud, Brave Heart.

Which appropriately and ironically reduces the whole episode to its proper farcical status.

Slander, though it has titillated many newspapermen, was, after all, a very minor factor in the *Tribune's* fortunes at this time. A much more serious fate was threatened by the death of Horace Greeley. The paper's identification with the great editor's name and personality meant serious loss of revenue and prestige when they were removed. Should the *Tribune* lose its founder's personal following in addition to the Republicans alienated by the late campaign, the residue would be not worth the salvaging. Prophecies were freely aired in the press concerning the paper's imminent dissolution. While Greeley was in his last illness, the *Times* ominously remarked:

Probably no journal in existence is so utterly dependent upon the life of one man as the *Tribune* is upon Mr. Greeley who created it and without whom it would be only a name.

The wish may have been father to the thought in the case of the *Tribune's* rivals, but there was certainly a real basis for the belief. Some time after Greeley's death, the young editorial writer, Joseph Bucklin Bishop, returned to his native town. An acquaintance asked him where he was employed, and upon Bishop's rejoinder that he was still with the *Tribune*, the rustic ejaculated, "With the *Try-bune!* Does it print yet? I thought Greeley was dead!"²⁷ And the circulation figures of 1873 were to show that Bishop's friend was not alone in his conception of the paper as purely an extension of the personality of its founder.

The stockholders of the *Tribune* Association shared in some measure the popular belief. Not only had they acceded to Greeley's will in everything, despite his feeble financial standing in their group, but they further revealed their appreciation of his value by heavily insuring the editor's life. This foresight gave them little comfort in the dark winter of 1872, however; shaken by the calamitous event of the campaign, they were panic-stricken by the passing of their leader. Shares which at their peak had brought \$10,000, ex dividend, were, as malicious rivals reported, "hawked about the streets" at \$6,000. Fear divided counsels, and made the *Tribune* "stockocracy" (Watterson's phrase) a fertile field for intrigue.

For even if, as the skeptics averred, the *Tribune* without Greeley was only a name, it was still a potent name, and many were those who would gladly have assumed it. Numerous candidates for the editorship presented themselves, and there were strong political undercurrents setting against the Liberal policy which the paper had of late adventured.

Whitelaw Reid was the logical heir apparent. He was Greeley's choice, and had proved his mettle in actual combat. He represented a link with the past and knew his ground. His personal hold on the subscribers was not, of course, as strong as Greeley's, particularly outside of New York City, but the weekly field was rapidly being restricted by the growth of local dailies anyway. And he did have the confidence and respect of the staff.

But such qualifications went for nothing without the backing of a majority of the stock of the *Tribune* Association, and in the

chaotic state of that organization other influences were on hand to play their part. Reid was not a wealthy man at this time, and his own stake in the paper's shares was small. He had the support of the editorial department as represented among the stockholders, but that, too, was insufficient in itself to secure control. Hay wrote to his mother, "If there is any attempt to oust him (Reid) I shall oppose it with all the means in my power."²⁸ But Hay was also exceeding small fry financially, then. The Reid faction lacked a war chest.

Other aspirants were better provided. John Russell Young, in difficulties with his short-lived *New York Standard*, but a passionate supporter of Grant, was anxious to return to the *Tribune*. He had the egregious Ben Butler as an ally, but the Young candidacy was abortive. More serious opposition to Reid came from a group in political alliance with Conkling.

William Orton was the leader. He had been involved in the move to oust Greeley from the City Committee in the "reorganization" of 1871, and was regarded as high in the councils of the regular organization. Furthermore, he was a power in the money world, president of the Western Union Telegraph Company and intimate with the sources of capital. He entered the contest for the control of the paper with formidable weapons.

Orton's victory meant certain reversal of the policy for which Greeley had ventured so hardily, but it was made well-nigh inevitable by the defection of Samuel Sinclair. The publisher was also the largest stockholder; his twenty shares gave Orton a wedge which nearly overturned the *Tribune*. Other stockholders followed Sinclair's lead. The Greeley estate had been left by his last will to his daughters *in toto*, with Ida, the eldest, as executrix. Sinclair, as executor of a previous testament, contested this will, and the Greeley shares were tied up by the litigation. In one fashion or another, Orton obtained options on a majority of the active stock, and Reid's case seemed hopeless. He resigned, with John Hay, taking a short time to get the office in shape for his successor.

Meanwhile the press was rife with speculation as to the identity of this successor. James G. Blaine was suggested, but it was soon decided that Schuyler Colfax was the man whom the Sinclair-Or-

ton combination were grooming for the post. And then a storm burst forth. The "Smiler," as he was known, was a person of some political importance who had served as Vice-President of the United States. But his experience in journalism was confined to an unimportant sheet in South Bend, and he represented all that the *Tribune* had fought in the Grant Administration.

Letters poured in on Reid begging him to stand firm and repel the invader. Charles Dudley Warner wailed his disgust:

Why don't you get for editor of the *Tribune*, Victoria, or Plon Plon, or ex-Napoleon III, or Kossuth, or the Equator, or Daniel Pratt, or the Milky Way, or the Committee of Seventy, or Weed's Sewing Machine, or the Ten Commandments, or the Multiplication Table—something that is well known in and has the confidence of the back districts? I hope the Lord will give me to see the day when a good newspaper will command itself.²⁹

More succinctly, John Defrees, public printer under Lincoln, characterized this attempt to replace Greeley by Colfax as "a very silly effort to fill a very great void by the insertion of a very small cork."³⁰

The press joined in the hue and cry—the Liberal and Democratic papers raked Sinclair and Orton unmercifully over the coals and the regulars were unsympathetic. Even the *Sun* relaxed its attacks on Reid as the alternative to him was presented.

The clamor may have had its effect; Orton may have overextended his credit. While Reid was putting the office in order, before his departure, an opportunity was offered to buy a majority of the options. Reid collected a syndicate—Governor Sprague, the young and wealthy William Walter Phelps and the puissant Jay Gould—and whipped together a majority of the stock. Orton was permitted to retain one of the fifty-one shares which had so nearly altered *Tribune* history and was named a trustee of the Association as a sop. Sinclair was out and Reid took over the tasks of both editor and publisher. To ensure his tenure, the article of the bylaws which provided for an annual election of these officers was altered, and Reid signed a contract for five years, guaranteed by heavy penalties. He was thus placed in absolute control of the paper's policies for that period, and enabled to consolidate his position in the Association to the point of impregnability. From

that time until the day of his death, Whitelaw Reid was master of the *Tribune's* destiny.

The outcome of the battle for the paper was announced publicly in a long editorial on December 23, the substance of which lies in the following paragraph:

It is now possible to state . . . that as a result of certain intrigues and outside efforts, to gain control of the paper, and wrest it from the purpose to which our late chief devoted it, some changes have taken place in the proprietorship, and a large majority of the stock is concentrated in the hands of Mr. Greeley's chosen editorial associates,—men whom he trained for this particular duty, to whom he entrusted the management of his journal in the gravest emergencies, whom he honored with the confidence of his thoughts and wishes and whose purpose it now is to continue the work from which he was so suddenly called away.

Again came a storm of letters, hailing the new administration, and the congratulations of the press. Horace White, Mark Twain, Bret Harte, John Bigelow and E. L. Godkin were among those who praised. The *Sun*, by now almost friendly, added its reserved felicitation: "We are glad that Mr. Whitelaw Reid got hold of the *Tribune*,—and we hope he will do well with it."

But the victory had not been a cheap one. In terms of cash, the half interest in the paper cost \$500,000. To obtain this, the dubious figure of Jay Gould must enter the *Tribune* picture, and though his role as stockholder was not an active one, his mere presence was sufficient to ruin the composition in the eyes of jaundiced critics. Gould was indeed an unwelcome necessity; his connection was not of long duration nor, by the conditions of Reid's contract, was he able to exercise a decisive influence. But his name cast a spell over the *Tribune* hard to exorcise. The alert contemporaries of the paper professed to regard Gould as the owner and mourned the lost integrity of the press. The *Sun*, returning to slangandering ways, was fond of referring to the Tribune Building as Gould's office. He was a cross.

But the main point had been gained. The *Tribune* was indeed in the grip of the Greeley tradition, and those closest to the life of the paper were content. When Reid and Hay resigned, many of their associates were anxious to imitate them; when, in Bret Harte's phrase, the Prince came into his own again, the "office

floor was littered with torn-up resignations”³¹ and the staff celebrated the event (rendered even happier by sundry salary increases) with a feast at Delmonico’s. Bayard Taylor, dean of those who had erected the triumphant structure of the old *Tribune*, was far away in Switzerland, but he too rejoiced in Reid’s victory. In a letter to John Russell Young he gave his blessing to the new order:

The *second* revolution inside the *Tribune* accords with my own ideas of what the paper should be *now*, and what it should seek to become. Reid and Hay together are not likely to make any serious mistake; to a certain extent they complement each other. The news that the Sinclair, Orton and Colfax arrangement was overthrown, was the best I have received for many a day. We live in an age of little principle and less faith, but I never more firmly believed in something higher than interest and expediency than just now; and I am willing to stand or fall in that belief.³²

CHAPTER VII

SALVAGE

WITH the *Tribune* safely in the hands of Whitelaw Reid, the slow, hard task of rehabilitation was begun. The parlous condition of the paper at the end of 1872 is best expressed by the circulation figures, since the direct income from subscribers made up more than half of the total income of the newspaper of 1872. Advertising earnings lagged somewhat in reflecting the altered state of affairs, but every canceled subscription was pure loss.

For those pre-A. B. C. days it is difficult to appraise circulation exactly. The practice of buying back unsold copies from newsdealers offered rare opportunities for business managers to overstate their market with a technically clear conscience. Such advertising manuals as existed were hard put to find a basis for their figures; sometimes they accepted the bare word of the managers, sometimes they received sworn statements and frequently they made their own estimates, allowing a liberal margin for error. Even then, the manuals were sometimes accused of distorting circulation for political effect. The newspapers themselves were naturally addicted to expressing their subscription lists in the most favorable terms—papers with a large out-of-town market, such as the *Tribune*, relied on post office statements, while those of more limited range, like the *Sun* and *Herald*, used their large daily turnover to impress the advertiser.

In spite of such discrepancies, however, Rowell's *Newspaper Annual* indicates the trend sufficiently well for present purposes. According to this authority, the *Tribune* in 1868 had a daily circulation of 43,000. The *Sun*, which Dana acquired in that year, was credited with 46,000 daily readers and the *Herald* with 65,000. The *Times*, reflecting Raymond's loss of political prestige in his last years, could boast only 35,000 circulation, the same as that of the *World*. In the weekly field, the *Tribune* maintained the outstanding relative position which it had acquired during the war;

its army of 190,000 subscribers was more than double the size of that of its closest competitor, the weekly *World*.

By 1872, the effects of the post-war constriction in the weekly editions of the metropolitan press had become apparent. The daily circulation of the *Tribune* had increased to 45,000, but the management could claim only 150,000 readers for the weekly. The circulation of the other papers reveals how the energetic hand of Dana was affecting the semi-moribund *Sun*, and how George Jones's sturdy regularity helped the *Times*:

	Daily	Weekly
<i>Sun</i> (claimed) over	100,000	40,000
<i>Times</i> “	50,000	60,000
<i>World</i> (about)	26,000	72,000
<i>Herald</i> “	45,000	25,000

Rowell in 1873 gives ample evidence of the loss which the profession believed that the *Tribune* had sustained by the venture—some independence of its old chief, and by his death. The other morning papers showed little change, except for the *Herald*, which nearly doubled its daily circulation, and the *Times*, which increased its weekly circulation by 25%. But Greeley's paper, while losing only 3,000 of its local readers, was estimated to have seen nearly half of its weekly subscription list vanish in the smoke of the campaign and its tragic aftermath. From over 200,000 in the flush times of the war, the weekly *Tribune* had dwindled to a mere 85,000. From the standpoint of American journalism, the significant fact is that only a very small proportion of the loss was salvaged by other New York papers; the great majority of weekly *Tribune* readers took to their local press.

The new proprietor had a task of Herculean proportions before him. The *Tribune* had been run on an annual budget of nearly a million dollars. In good years, the return on the outlay was between 10% and 15%, but this margin was not very secure; in Young's time the paper barely paid its way. Now, with half of the weekly circulation gone, profits disappeared completely for a time, and were replaced by a staggering deficit—as high as \$96,000 in one year.¹ Small wonder, then, that the stockholders had been panic-stricken! To complicate matters, Reid as publisher faced

a "horrible state of chaos" in the administration of the business side of the paper, a legacy of Sinclair's lax methods.²

In these depressing circumstances, with onlookers freely predicting the total disappearance of the paper, a vigorous policy in its conduct was essential to confute the skeptics. But in addition it was necessary to reassure doubtful subscribers of the paper's stability by some stroke which would reveal the confidence of the managers in their own destiny. The opportunity for such a *coup* lay ready to Reid's hand.

The "old rookery" which housed the paper had been an object of concern to the owners for many years. The fine structures in which the *Times* and the *Herald* were produced were a standing rebuke to the *Tribune's* inadequate quarters. To fill the want, land had been purchased, and a reserve fund for building had been accumulated out of the paper's surplus, but the expensive and unsettling changes which had occurred in the organization since the war postponed construction. Now, when a new building would serve the dual purpose of providing much-needed facilities and of advertising to the world the faith of the owners in the permanence of their journal, Reid determined to set the architects to work.

He proceeded with his habitual energy. On May 13, 1873, the *Tribune* forces moved to temporary quarters on Spruce Street, and the construction of the "Tall Tower" was begun on the old site. It proved to be a lengthy task. Designed by Richard M. Hunt, and built on a scale and with a finish unknown in the newspaper world of the day, progress was impeded by labor troubles, and it was not until the paper's thirty-fourth birthday, April 10, 1875, that the new building was formally opened. Reid's heart was in the work, and his friends shared his lively interest, writing humorous condolences on his troubles and helpful suggestions for their solution.

When the difficulties had all been surmounted, the staff moved into the finest home that any American journal could boast. In mere size it was imposing. The tower, on the style of a Florentine campanile, jutted from between Mansard shoulders to a height of two hundred and sixty feet, the tallest building in the city—except Trinity Church!

The construction work was well and durably done. Solid masonry walls, "more strongly built than the temple of Paestum or the aqueduct of Segovia" supported the tower, and in time received with equanimity the added burden of increased height. The building stands facing City Hall Park today, a little archaic, perhaps, with the original proportions somewhat marred by alteration, a monument to the courage of an editor who dared give such an impressive hostage to fortune at a time when he was regarded as the leader of a forlorn hope.

Internally, the new building was all that a newspaperman of the 'seventies could wish. High on the ninth floor was the light and airy composing room, the most comfortable place in which to set type of any American newspaper. On the floor below was the heart of the *Tribune*. In the center was Reid's luxurious little suite, a nexus of pushbuttons and pneumatic tubes, warmed, on Halstead's suggestion (for the "editor of the *Commercial* held strong views on the subject of steam heat in the sanctum") by a cozy log fire.³ To the left of this apartment were the editorial rooms, and to the right, the city room. The crowded, dirty quarters had vanished with the old building, there were enough desks to go around, "real water" in the wash basins—in fine, in the words of an envious contemporary, "there isn't an editor-in-chief in the city as well cared for as the humblest reporter on the *Tribune*."⁴

In keeping with the progressive character of the establishment the presses in the basement were reinforced by a new Hoe web affair that tossed off 16,000 to 18,000 *Tribunes* in an hour. This speed enabled George Pearce, the night editor, to keep the forms open until 3 A. M., instead of locking half of them at midnight. In the basement were other attractions besides those which drew the connoisseur of newspaper technology. Breaking with the Greeley bonedry tradition, a beer saloon was installed there, where "Brother Bial, a high priest among the Arions," dispensed the rollicking lager to thirsty gentlemen of the press. This was a local rendezvous of the Bohemians, and "a jolly good place to lunch"—thanks to song-loving Brother Bial and his brew.

The new building, from composing case to lunchroom, provided working conditions as nearly ideal, physically, as possible. The importance of this factor in production is hard to overestimate—

to it may be due at least part of the fidelity which the *Tribune* staff showed toward their place of work. The advertising value of the structure was also great. The "Tall Tower" became the symbol of the *Tribune* in cartoon and editorial. All New York grew to connect the journal which it had so recently consigned to dissolution with the new, expensive and solid-looking "sky-scraper" on Park Row and the permanence of the *Tribune* in the life of the city seemed assured. The new building was a wise investment.

There were times, however, when Reid may have been tempted to doubt the wisdom of his venture. Work had barely gotten under way on the Tall Tower when the fall of Jay Cooke's banking house precipitated a disastrous panic, prelude to a long period of severe depression. In the already dangerous condition of the paper, combined with the expensive committals involved in the building operations, it seems a miracle that the *Tribune* survived. Fortunately Reid combined acute business talents with his tested editorial abilities; he snuggled down against the storm and rode it out triumphantly, paying all bills promptly and maintaining a respectable balance in the bank.⁵

To perform this feat meant grueling hard work for Reid in his dual role as editor and publisher. Lacking the now indispensable telephone, Reid remained at the office long hours, even fitting up a bedroom in the Tower for emergencies which required his constant attendance. Fortunately, during the most trying period he had the loyal support of John Hay and of J. R. G. Hassard, who was managing editor in fact though not in name.

The situation demanded more sacrifices than those of time and energy, however. Newspaper costs are stubborn; it is difficult to reduce them without serious damage to the efficiency of the paper. Fortunately, the price of paper, a huge item, fell off considerably, but other charges resisted the editor's efforts. Composition was one of these—in 1873, the composing-room expenses were \$117,180; in 1875 they had climbed to \$154,788.⁶ Two years later Reid decided to use drastic methods. He submitted a program of retrenchment to his typesetters, and on their rejection began to run the paper on a strict non-union basis. This method, as he told a reporter, saved \$35,000 a year, but involved a long chain of consequences, which will be related later.

More important, journalistically, were some of Reid's other economies. In every period of retrenchment, certain activities are bound to suffer somewhat greater curtailment than others, providing a measure of their value in the eyes of those in charge. In the case of the *Tribune* the changes were in the nature of a positive diversion of emphasis, as well as of negative economy, made in accord with Reid's idea of the future of his profession; and we are fortunate in possessing a detailed statement of these ideas, in an address which the editor delivered before the Editorial Associations of New York and Ohio in 1879.⁷

The prevailing trend in metropolitan journalism for some time past had been in the direction of expensive and spectacular feats of enterprise in newsgathering. In this competition, the *Tribune*, as has been shown, bore a brave and successful part. But under the stress of straitened financial circumstances in the late 'seventies, some of the papers were beginning to revalue these exploits. It was Reid's contention that "The field for advantages through enterprise in the mere getting of news is about exhausted." The next development, he felt, would be in the presentation of the tale: "the story better told; better brains employed in the telling." If, as he hoped, another Stanley should seek another Livingstone, a Macaulay should record the event.

In making a newspaper, the heaviest item of expense used to be the white paper. Now it is the news. By and by, let us hope, it will be the brains.

To a certain extent Reid's judgment was vindicated in his own lifetime. The *Tribune* under his hand strove with great success to achieve the ideal of a paper of brains, and in skill of presentation the *Sun* has never been surpassed. But Reid's prognostications were based on the then existing papers and their particular class of readers. The great journalistic successes of the future, with their potent influence on the whole press, were achieved by getting beyond (or below) the strata to which the *Sun*, the *Herald*, the *Times* and the *Tribune* appealed. Reid recognized this possibility, but regarded it, apparently, as remote. When it occurred, his whole chart of journalistic progress went somewhat askew.

The reason for Reid's confidence in the preservation of the

status quo in journalism lay in his belief in his colleagues' superiority to the masses they addressed. There is, said he, "not a New York newspaper but is better than its audience." In catering to the tastes of the majority of readers lay, he felt, the great journalistic opportunity of the day:

There is not an Editor in New York who does not know the fortune that awaits the man there who is willing to make a daily paper as disreputable and vile as a hundred and fifty thousand readers would be willing to buy.

The statement affords a clew to the stubborn conservatism of the *Tribune* in matters of taste; the long battle to avoid the sensationalism of the yellow press. Reid's canons were impervious to the wail of the circulation manager; he believed in something apart from financial returns in his profession. Certain features of his creed may have been intrinsically wrong in the face of changing standards, but his refusal to bend has the merit of courage. And when the circle had come round again, enabling a vigorous prosecution of dignified ideals of journalism, the *Tribune* was able to follow the lead of Ochs with a tradition unstained by compromise.

The *Tribune* exemplified Reid's ideas best in the period of the 'seventies. The staff consisted mainly of holdovers from the Greeley regime, and it was first-rate. No sweeping change of personnel followed 1872—Reid believed in preserving men who had proved their worth. This system was opposed to the practice of Bennett and later of Pulitzer, both of whom acted on the principle that writers were at their best when the sword of dismissal hung by a thread over their wracked brains. In the frenetic competition of daily journalism with its insistence on "enterprise in the mere getting of news" the Bennett principle has its advantages, though the corollaries of intraoffice suspicion and spies, constant intrigue and strain, are certainly not conducive to the peaceful life. In the *Tribune* the pace was more leisurely and companionable. "In fact, a situation on the *Tribune* is regarded in the profession as a certainty. The shaking-up process is not in vogue or favor there."⁸

The result of this tolerant attitude was to give the *Tribune* a very distinct character. The turnover of the staff was very slow.

Men of ability lasted out their lives in the office, or, straying from the fold, tended to return again. Reputations were made, specialists grew in authority without the necessity of subjecting their style or thought to unsettling changes of management. The *Tribune* system offered a very real encouragement to brains in the sense in which Reid employed the term—the expression of reasoned opinions as opposed to “enterprise” alone.

An illustration of the effect of Reid's practice is provided by George W. Smalley in London. In 1870, the correspondent had abandoned the more sensational field of personal “enterprise” in order to act as coördinator of the *Tribune's* European staff. In the wars that plagued Southern Europe after the Treaty of Frankfort, the *Tribune* failed to duplicate its earlier exploits, but Smalley steadily rose to consequence as the interpreter of European politics to the American public. He took de Blowitz as his model, rather than Forbes. In this later career the work of Smalley was characterized by conscientiousness in detail and an almost crabbed integrity of mind, which, frequently running counter to American prejudices, aroused considerable hostility in this country.

Smalley readily adapted himself to his English environment, even in such items as attention to dress—which would have provoked the hostility of his hard-bitten associates on this side of the water. In London, however, his dandyism was regarded tolerantly; it probably was instrumental in bringing him into that close contact with English governmental circles upon which his usefulness depended. Certain it is that he faithfully reflected the attitude of those circles. So successfully, in fact, did he win English favor that in 1890 he became the American correspondent of the great *Times* itself, and Henry Watterson remarked that he would probably end up in Parliament.⁹

Smalley's identification with certain aspects of English Society sometimes carried him counter to the main stream of the *Tribune* editorial policy. The paper was in sympathy with the Liberal party in England, to such an extent, indeed, as to prejudice Reid's appointment as Minister to Great Britain during Conservative ascendancy. The feeling became especially marked during the Home Rule agitation of the 'eighties, for the *Tribune* shared the common American sympathy with Ireland. Smalley, on the other hand, took

the Unionist side of the controversy. With a tolerance which has always been a notable tradition of the *Tribune*, Reid permitted his subordinate to air his own views freely, and the paper presented the then remarkable spectacle of two conflicting viewpoints in the same paper. Smalley's course drew upon him the wrath of much of the press, Lawrence Godkin, the brilliant Irishman at the helm of the *Nation* and the *Post*, taking the honors with his sarcastic maledictions on the "Tory Squire."¹⁰

Smalley's extreme conscientiousness in his work has been recorded in the memoirs of Harry Furniss, the artist of *Punch*. When on week-ends in country houses, Smalley always insisted on posting his letters in person, even trudging through the rain to a distant office while his fellow guests confided their correspondence to a groom. On one such occasion the *Tribune* correspondent overheard the postmistress remark, "That gent must be carrying on with some lady, he must, or he wouldn't be so mighty particular about posting 'is letters 'iself." Fidelity to the service of his paper entailed a measure of calumny—though Furniss adds that Smalley was not displeased at the soft impeachment.¹¹

The *Tribune's* correspondence at Washington was in the hands of men of renown almost equal to that of G. W. Smalley. Zebulon White remained in charge for many years after the Senate investigation over the Treaty of Washington. He was assisted, and eventually succeeded by Eugene Virgil Smalley, whose excellence was early recognized by an offer from the Associated Press to take over its Washington Bureau. Smalley wrote for the *Tribune* until 1882, when he entered the service of the Northern Pacific Railroad.

For a brief period, Reid's Albany correspondent was his friend John Bigelow. Bigelow was the intimate associate of Samuel Tilden, and when the latter rose to the governorship on the stepping stone of the Tweed Ring investigation, Bigelow's information from the seat of state government was distinguished both for style and authenticity. This was especially important in that Tilden was regarded by the *Tribune* and the Liberals generally as a possible alternative to unregenerate Republicanism.

With its permanent bureaus in the charge of such able men, the *Tribune* was assured of a news staple corresponding to Reid's

ideal. In special assignments, the paper was less enterprising than previously, but in at least one instance Reid's concept of a Macaulay on the track of a "beat" seemed destined to be realized. Ralph Keeler, in the '70's, had an outstanding literary reputation among the practicing newspapermen of the day. Something of a Bohemian, his ventures into the magazines had won high praise and he was the author of an unsuccessful, though meritorious, novel. When America was seething over the Spanish execution of the filibustering crew of the *Virginius*, Reid detailed Keeler to investigate the Cuban situation for the *Tribune*.

Keeler was the first "special" to arrive in Havana after the capture of the *Virginius*. He took ship for Santiago, and the purser later announced that the *Tribune* man had gone ashore at Manzanillo—where all trace of the unfortunate correspondent vanished completely. The most prosaic explanation is that he was robbed and murdered on his trip ashore, no unlikely event in the disturbed condition of the "Pearl of the Antilles" at this time. But the gossip of American reporters in the cafés of Havana gave a more sinister explanation of the incident—Keeler, ran the story, was a secret agent of the State Department, and his death occurred not on the Beach at Manzanillo but on shipboard. Minions of the Spanish government had tipped him over the rail.¹² The enigma was never solved; poor Keeler disappeared as thoroughly as did little Charlie Ross, a year later. The episode remains one of the tragic and romantic mysteries of the American press.

The local news, under the fostering care of Shanks, maintained its standard in the new regime. The outstanding events of the New York courts in the early '70's were the Beecher-Tilton cases. The *Tribune* deplored editorially the prurient interest which the press took in Theodore Tilton's marital misfortunes, but claimed that, in justice to the parties concerned, full publicity was essential. The *Tribune's* contribution to this cause was a verbatim account of both trials, so accurate that by common consent of court and counsel it was adopted as a court record.

In Reid's conception of the newspaper's role of intelligent commentator, political discussion was naturally an important ingredient. The regular editorial staff bore the brunt of this work very successfully. Young Joseph Bishop, Isaac N. Ford, a polished

writer who later became Smalley's successor in London, the versatile Hassard and the invaluable John Hay formed the nucleus remaining from Greeley's day. John F. Cleveland wrote on financial subjects and compiled the *Tribune Almanac* until his death in 1876. Cleveland's reputation for integrity, bound up as it was with his intimate connection with Greeley, made a valuable set-off to the rumors of Gould's influence in the paper's financial policy.

Cleveland was succeeded in the conduct of the financial section by Col. William Mason Grosvenor, a burly, forceful gentleman of real mathematical genius. A soldier in the Civil War, Grosvenor was editor of the *St. Louis Democrat* during the Greeley campaign, and later formed a short-lived alliance with Joseph Pulitzer (who had just sold out his interest in the *Westliche Post* of the same city) for the perpetuation of Liberal ideas. The firm of "Bill and Joe" broke up, and in 1875 Grosvenor came to the *Tribune*. His statistical ability had been proved by an elaborate comparison in 1872-'73 between the whiskey production of St. Louis distillers and the revenue accruing therefrom to the government, indicating fraud on the part of the liquor interests and leading to Secretary Bristow's famous exposure of the Whiskey Ring. While with the *Tribune*, Grosvenor's fame increased; he became editor of *Dun's Review* and was frequently consulted by government experts on tariff and currency legislation.

Grosvenor's keenness in mathematical deduction, evidenced in part by his ability to play three games of chess simultaneously, was of direct service to the *Tribune* in the cipher disclosures of 1878, when he acted as Hassard's collaborator. He remained on the staff until his death in 1900.

Another writer of a mathematical turn who joined the *Tribune* staff in the 'seventies was Edward McPherson. McPherson served two terms in Congress and sixteen years as Clerk of the House; he had Greeley's interest in political statistics and became an authority on the subject. In 1877, he was made editor of the *Tribune Almanac*, continuing until 1895.

John Hay left the *Tribune* in 1875, on the occasion of his marriage to Miss Clara Louise Stone. Removed to Cleveland, business and politics, he still retained a close connection with Reid and

with the paper. Political articles, advice and literary criticism came from Cleveland and from Washington in welcome quantities—the ties between Hay and the *Tribune* were not broken, they were merely stretched a bit. And in 1881, Hay returned for a season to substitute for Reid on the occasion of the latter's wedding trip—but that is a part of the later story.

Hay's witty companionship was missed by his colleagues of the editorial room but the gap was filled by another of his excellent breed. In 1873, Isaac H. Bromley, a graduate of Yale in the class of '53, soldier, editor and politician, was translated from the columns of the *Sun* to those of the *Tribune*. "Brom" was a native of Connecticut and had been prominent in the journalism of that state. He had a sturdy vein of New England honesty; though an earnest partizan, his pen was not that of a mercenary, but of one who fights for a cause he believes just. His method of warfare was, to say the least, startling to the readers of the *Tribune*—it was the application of the uproarious humor of a Mark Twain to political controversy.

Bromley's editorials were masterpieces of telling farce. Hyperbole and extravagant metaphor seemed to be applied with a lavish brush, yet beneath the riot of color the pattern of sarcasm was delicate and finished. To change the figure, Bromley flourished a cutlass, but drove home his point with the art of a master of the rapier. The effect was unique, and Bromley was feared and beloved. Such an outrageous characterization as that of Senator Logan, in full tide of oratory, a "spavined night-mare on the track of a beautiful dream," was inevitably cherished by the readers thereof.

"Brom" was exceedingly happy in his personal relationships with the staff, an outstanding member of the coterie of which Hay, Winter, Hassard and Bishop cherished so many memories. He was both kindly and witty in his everyday contacts with his associates, possessed of a spirit which helped grease the wheels of the relentless newspaper grind. One fantastic production of this spirit attained world-wide fame, a bit of doggerel that has been translated into French and Latin. One summer evening in 1875, "Brom" was traveling uptown on a street car with a friend from the office. On the car wall hung a placard of instructions to em-

ployees and patrons, which to Bromley's agile mind conveyed poetic possibilities. He developed the theme, and the result appeared in the *Tribune*:

Conductor, when you receive a fare
Punch in the presence of the passenjare!
A blue trip slip for an eight-cent fare
A buff trip slip for a six-cent fare
A pink trip slip for a three-cent fare
Punch in the presence of the passenjare!

Chorus

Punch, brothers! Punch with care!
Punch in the presence of the passenjare!

The rhyme swept the land. Its "damnable iteration" inspired Mark Twain to write a skit on the manner in which Bromley's *opus* seized upon the mind and the havoc it created. In consequence, he was regarded as the author, until Bromley stepped from behind his discreet anonymity and acknowledged his responsibility. The power of the jingle to play an insistent counterpoint to mental processes has not diminished—read twice, the rhythm is hard to exorcise.¹³

Bromley and the rest of the permanent staff provided a running commentary on the news of the day, but this work was not confined to the regular establishment alone. Independents were enlisted, personalities who were themselves news. In the paper's prospectus for 1878, the contributors included Hugh McCulloch, Gail Hamilton, Wade Hampton, Thurlow Weed, John Bigelow, Parke Godwin, E. L. Godkin, E. C. Stedman, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Mrs. Rebecca Harding Davis—a catholic and authoritative group.

The presence of names distinguished in literature will be noted on the list, as well as those of political commentators. Indeed, it may be said that the most distinctive feature of Reid's "new departure" in journalism lay in the emphasis placed upon arts and letters. The *Tribune* under the hand of Greeley's successor amplified the already high reputation which its founder had secured for his paper in that direction. This was a natural development; Reid's interest in intellectual pursuits and his close affiliations

with the young *literati* of the Century Association has already been mentioned. He had a trained critical staff ready to his hand, and their work was an essential part of the newspaper of brains. Moreover, the *Tribune* was in a political backwater, in a sense, from 1872 until 1876, and literature and art profited thereby. The four years of the *Tribune's* political insurgency were a veritable golden age of criticism in the paper, and the legacy of that fruitful period remained as a valuable element.

The regular critical staff at this time were all of the old regime. George Ripley, the gentle Transcendentalist, remained in charge of the literary department until his death in 1882. He possessed a fine mind and taste, coupled with infinite patience and industry, but he was hampered by the traditions of his calling as well as by his innate goodness of heart. Book reviewing in the daily journal of his time did not possess the reputation which it enjoys at present. The quarterly or monthly magazine still ruled that field, and Ripley deserves great credit for raising the status of his branch of the guild. Necessities of time and space made the discussion of books in the dailies a rather irregular proceeding; volumes were criticized long after their appearance, and specialists were seldom employed for the purpose. Little attempt was made to synthesize a work under review; a few drops of comment were usually swamped by oceans of scissored quotation. Ripley had Bayard Taylor and John Hay in support, and, on the whole, the *Tribune's* literary comment was, despite a tendency toward over-amiability, probably the finest of any newspaper in the country.

But the *Tribune's* contribution to literature was not confined to criticism of current works. The news and editorials were in themselves examples of style, and Reid secured the services of men of letters to add to the grace of his pages. A distinguished Parisian, Arsène Houssaye, former head of the National Theater under Napoleon III, contributed letters from the French capital which covered a wide range of intellectual and artistic subjects with true Gallic charm, and supplemented the work of Huntington, the regular Paris man, in the field of social and official gossip.

Houssaye had been writing to the paper but a short time, when Reid received the following letter from John Hay:

Cleveland,
July 24th, 1875

Dear Mr. Reid:

Henry James, Jr., wants to write for the *Tribune*, letters from Paris, where he is going to live for some time to come. He considers the *Tribune* the only paper where business could be combined with literary ambition. I hope you will engage him in place of Houssaye. He will write better letters than anybody—you know his wonderful style and keen observation of life and character. He has no hesitation in saying that he can beat Houssaye on his own ground, gossip and chronicle, and I agree with him. Besides, his name is almost, if not quite, equally valuable—and far more regarded by cultivated people. He would cost not more than half what Houssaye costs (counting translation) and I think his letters would be about twice as good. He would not interfere with Huntington but would simply take Houssaye's place—and in my opinion fill it much better.

He will start in the autumn sometime. You might let Houssaye run on until James gets there and then discharge him with a Grantish letter telling him how delighted you and the public have been with his letters, but that the labor of translation has been very difficult and now has become impossible through the removal from New York of the invaluable rooster who did it, etc., etc.

In short, this is the statement. You pay Houssaye \$30. for a not very good letter and me, Heaven knows how much for translating it. For, say, \$20. or \$25. James will write you a much better letter and sign his name to it.

His address is 20 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass. You can write him or to me.

Yours faithfully, Hay.¹⁴

James was forthwith engaged, and nineteen of his letters appeared in the *Tribune*. They were well displayed, and the author's objection to "cross heads" cutting up his copy was respected. But, as may be imagined, the work of the novelist who wrote like a philosopher was not ideally suited to newspaper needs. Reid tried to have James alter his style in the direction of "brevity, variety, topics of wide interest . . . and above all brevity," but the author felt that such drastic revision of his normally verbose approach to his subjects would involve more labor than he cared to attempt—and would probably prove disappointing in the end. So the connection was dropped with expressions of mutual esteem and regret.

Charles Reade was more successful in his relations with the *Tribune*. The English novelist was a born controversialist, his style

was pithy and provoking and he had a distinctly realistic approach to his newspaper work. He startled Reid with a proposal to take part payment for his articles in advertising, saying, "I do beg of you to consider that I sell ideas and words and you sell advertisements, and what I propose is a just exchange of commodities." When the arrangements had been completed, Reade wrote again:

When I can find a powerful vehicle in England I propose to treat the rights and wrongs of authors, and expose the cant and equivokes, and droll errors of statesmen and judges and the false arithmetic of publicists, and pour the light of common sense and idiomatic English on the subject. These articles shall be sent to you in advance and will, I think, open everybody's eyes more or less.¹⁵

Reade succeeded in this object, especially in his discussion of the copyright, a subject of engrossing interest to all the writers of the last century.

The products of many other distinguished pens appeared in Reid's *Tribune* with more or less regularity. Rebecca Harding Davis, propaganda novelist of the 'sixties, wrote many editorials on social subjects beginning in 1869. Bret Harte was another frequent contributor. Reid had requested his services during the bad days of December, 1872, and received the Westerner's hearty assent together with congratulations on the successful issue of the fight for the paper's control:

I really want to connect myself in ever so humble a fashion with the *Tribune*, which after this sore travail really seems to have been born again, and to promise all that I, in my younger newspaper days, used to dream of as my ideal of journalism. So look for me, with slips, before long, when the year is new.¹⁶

Among the occasional contributors was Walt Whitman, whose "Death Sonnet for Custer" was printed in the *Tribune*, and paid for, at the poet's request, in the modest sum of \$10.

But literature was not the only form of artistic endeavor encouraged by the *Tribune*. Clarence Cook remained through the 'seventies, scarifying the painter and sculptor. His strictures on the art of the Centennial Exhibition were in his finest vein, and in a manner quite the reverse of George Ripley's. Cook encouraged

endeavor in his field—showing forth his love in copious chastenings. William Winter, also, was continuing along the road to fame and authority in the realm of the stage, staunchly upholding moral, Anglo-Saxon, dramatic art and the stock company. And Hassard applied his tolerant understanding to music.

The great event of the musical world in the 'seventies was the first performance of Wagner's *Ring of the Nibelungs* at Bayreuth. This took place in the summer of 1875, and Hassard was on hand to report it. The hardest struggle of the composer had already been won, recognition was his, but the opening of the *Festspielhaus* was attended by some of the echoes of the earlier controversy. Kings and princes were there, lending a fortuitous news value, and Hassard's account paid due regard to this side of the topic. But it is pleasing to note, and characteristic of Reid's *Tribune*, that the story was featured as an artistic event of the first rank.

First page accounts of the performances, editorials and elaborate and extensive explanations of the master's purpose were given. The editorial comment was somewhat noncommittal, withholding judgment as to the musical value of the dramas, but giving full credit to Wagner's personal courage. Hassard's account, on the other hand, gave it as the "general verdict" that "it is a triumph of the new school of music, final and complete." His story conveyed some of the excitement that pervaded the audience when the majestic Cycle first burst upon the world with all the force of brass and tympani—marred only by "some trivial arrangements of scenery." One such "trivial arrangement" crept into Hassard's relation, thanks to the composing room, which tacked a rather chilly ending on to a warm and glowing account of *Die Walkuere*:

At the close of the opera, when the entire back-ground of the stage was filled with a sea of *ice*, the spectacle was wonderful beyond words to describe it.

The *Tribune's* place in the intellectual world of the 'seventies was made secure, not only by the personnel, but by changes in make-up and sundry innovations. The columns were widened and the type made larger, so that the page was more attractive and easier to read. Then in 1875, Charles Francis Adams, Jr., sug-

gested that an index be added to the paper's apparatus for the convenience of scholars. He had been driven "nearly crazy" in his researches among American papers, and thought that the *Tribune* might advantageously copy the example of the *London Times*, and thus place itself "at the head of the press as the standard for reference," by publishing an annual index. In the office, an index had been in use for some years, rather crude and without cross-references. Adams proceeded to go into details of cost and possible sale of a public edition so persuasively that in 1876 an index for the preceding year was issued.¹⁷ John Weinheimer of the editorial staff, who had been an office boy when Reid first entered the paper, took the matter in charge. At first the index was clumsy, using a confusing system of subject headings, but in time the crudities were ironed out, and the *Tribune Index* became an invaluable tool for all who used the American press. The publication was continued until 1907.

Another innovation, more reluctantly introduced, became in time a very important feature. Several of the New York journals had introduced a Sunday edition, differing little from the weekday paper. The *Tribune* attempted this in 1861, but soon abandoned it. Sabbatarian sentiment was very strong in the last century; many brought up in the straiter sects can remember the vaguely immoral flavor of the "funnies" of their childhood, and the exciting surreptitiousness of an after-Sunday-School malted milk. Reid was hesitant to affront this attitude. His own account tells the tale:

Nearly every man I knew approved of this refusal to print a Sunday paper. Old friends went out of their way to congratulate me on thus setting my face against the pernicious habit of Sunday publication. They hoped I would never yield; it was a noble stand and gave them yet greater confidence in my paper. Finally, as they kept introducing the subject, I took to explaining to these excellent and well-meaning people that my noble stand seemed to result in sending all my regular readers, when Sunday came, over to one or another of my competitors; and next, turning suddenly on each, I would ask, "By the way, what paper do *you* read on Sunday?" Then came stammering and hesitation to be sure; but not once during the years this went on, did I fail to find that, with the single exception of some of the clergy, the men who were thus exhorting me to continue setting a noble example were themselves quietly gratifying their own craving to know what was going on by reading some Sunday paper.¹⁸

The Sunday *Tribune* made its bow on December 6, 1879. It was usually a trifle larger than the daily edition, containing about sixteen pages, and a large portion of space was given to feature matter and literary items. In one issue, for instance, were articles by Mrs. Bayard Taylor on German Cookery and by the veteran editor C. T. Congdon on the personalities and events of his life. A column on "Knitting and Crochet," some notes headed "Science for the People" and an account of Barnum's Circus in winter quarters completed the miscellany. But the major share of the space was devoted to literature—much of it scissored from English periodicals—short stories, sketches and criticism.

The news was not, of course, neglected. The Sunday paper lent itself especially to the interpretive "Sunday cable" from London which Smalley introduced, half summary, half gossip. With its more leisurely preparation, the Sunday paper gave promise of becoming the metropolitan counterpart of the weekly editions, a journal of discussion and critical review. That in the *Tribune* it did so become is due in no small measure to the ability of a very extraordinary woman, the late Ellen Mackay Hutchinson Cortissoz.

"Nelly" Hutchinson, as she was known when she first joined the paper, began by writing reports of women's activities, conventions and the like, during Greeley's last years. Her agreeable and witty style won her a permanent place on the staff, which she consolidated by virtue of a real flair for literary criticism. As "feature editor" (though the title was not used at the time) she developed the Sunday *Tribune* into a human and intelligent forum, and, on the death of Ripley in 1882, became literary editor of the paper. She retained this position until her marriage with Royal Cortissoz in 1897. Mrs. Cortissoz was one of the first real newspaper women; she was highly respected by the staff in a day when women in professions were regarded with considerable skepticism. Whitelaw Reid deferred to her opinion, and the men who worked with her have retained her in memory as an able, helpful and efficient colleague. She was one of a series of woman journalists of which the *Tribune* is particularly proud.

With the successful introduction of the Sunday edition, the *Tribune* took on a form which persisted for twenty years with

little change. Circulation had been increased and reached a relatively stable and prosperous figure. The *Daily* hovered about 50,000 copies, the *Weekly* stood firmly at nearly 100,000, and the *Sunday Tribune* ranged between 50,000 and 75,000 for the remainder of the nineteenth century. The process had been slow in developing pecuniary returns; but by 1881 the *Tribune* was able to congratulate itself on having wiped off most of the mortgage on the "Tall Tower," and on the prospect of a speedy resumption of dividends—suspended until that end should be achieved. White-law Reid had succeeded in finding a market for the paper of brains and in attracting the clientèle that most appealed to him. As President Gilman of Johns Hopkins wrote him, "The *Tribune* hits college people so widely over the land that I shall be particularly glad to be heard by that audience which you command so completely." And William Cullen Bryant complained that through the *Tribune's* competition, the *Evening Post* "was losing the distinction of being the only paper for gentlemen and scholars."¹⁹

Many of the means by which this result was attained have been discussed. They were the logical upshot of Reid's conception of the journalist's function. In addition, the personality of the *Tribune's* editor was adapted to a more suave type of journalism than had been the previous rule. The *Tribune* ceased to be the visible expression of an individual; the new owner merged himself in the institution that the paper was rapidly becoming. As his biographer has said:

Reid's contribution, in short, to "personal journalism" was a kind of editorial management which sacrificed individual idiosyncrasy to the weight of the paper as an institution greater than any member of its staff.²⁰

This meant the gradual disappearance of the newspaper war. Reid refused to reply to personal attacks, and was slow to indulge in them. Something of lusty energy went out of the press thereby, but also much unseemly bickering. With the absence of slangandering and with a reserved approach, the *Tribune* became welcome in that more rarefied atmosphere which rejected Greeley's vehemence and "isms."

As the *Nation* said, "The *Tribune* has introduced one great

improvement into American journalism, in refraining from controversy with other newspapers."

But, lest this seem to infer that the *Tribune* had gone completely Brahminical, it is now advisable to turn to the political history of the 'seventies, and reveal that the cloak of dignity merely concealed, without impeding, the energy of a vigorous policy. The *Tribune*, in acquiring the respect of the cultured, did not lose that of the politician.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ADULLAMITES

EIGHTEEN SEVENTY-TWO was not only a year of turmoil in the internal organization, a year which reshaped the paper in a journalistic sense; it also diverted the political channels in which Greeley had guided his organ. At the death of the founder, White-law Reid was confronted with a delicate problem of conduct in his approach to a question of national government as well as to the technical details of his craft. In both spheres of action the personality and ideals of the young editor were of prime importance. The political course of the *Tribune* from 1872 to 1880 was consistent with its journalistic development.

The kernel of Reid's political philosophy in these years is to be found in an address which he delivered in 1873 before college audiences at Miami, Amherst and Dartmouth, *The Scholar in Politics*.¹ In substance, this address pleaded with the academically trained, the intelligent, to perform in political life the functions to which the speaker introduced them in journalism. The same insistence on the value of "brains" in the broader sense, as opposed to mere cleverness or emotionalism, which characterized the *Tribune* as a newspaper is to be found in the editor's appeal to the college youth of America: "He must permit the less intelligent to govern, or he must bring intelligence to the affairs of government."

A corollary of this plea for intelligence was to uphold, in Reid's phrase, "the sacred right of bolting and scratching." As "the main object of an old party becomes more and more the retention or the regaining of power, instead of the success of the fresh, vivid principles on which new parties are always organized," the duty of the intelligent man was to "resist the tyranny of party and the intolerance of political opinion, and to maintain actual freedom as well as theoretical liberty of thought."

This expression ranks Reid undeniably with the Mugwumps. He was not, like Henry Adams, daunted by the "turmoil . . .

deceit and dishonesty of politics"; he entered the arena, and was in time to feel, as did John Hay, Henry Cabot Lodge and Theodore Roosevelt, the tyranny of the majority, and to take a more tolerant view of the confining yet sustaining force of party organization. But at this time Reid and the *Tribune* may best be described by the term "highbrow." Contemporaries of a more disciplined stamp (in a political sense) so adjudged them; Thomas Nast always pictured Reid with his nose elevated above the crowd, the *Times* continued to refer to him as "the Professor," and the *Sun* asserted scornfully that "Jay Gould's young editor" was trying to "imitate the ponderosity and pompousness of London journals."

In the state of American politics at that time it was difficult for the really live intelligence, whether individual or journalistic, to avoid creating this impression. In the *Tribune's* particular case, it was impossible. Reunion with the Republican Party under the unchastened rule of Grant and his cohorts was inconceivable. Similarly, the alliance with the Democrats had been too tenuous and artificial to long endure on the basis of the Baltimore Convention, and the Liberal strength seemed dissipated in the courageous tilt with Administration windmills in 1872. Yet Reid always believed in party government as the one method by which the individual could influence the course of events. The *Tribune* went in search of a party.

This was not an easy task. Apart from the accumulated rancors and suspicions of the Grant regime and the Liberal revolt, there was little in either of the two major organizations to attract the "paper of brains." Each harbored many contrasting shades of opinion and practice; issues cut across party lines in a manner which is still all too familiar. No sharp distinction existed between the groups, except in tradition, and the *Tribune* in 1872 was essentially a young paper, looking with greater attention to the future than to the past. It was necessary to wait on events. Meanwhile "a pox on both your houses" was the human reaction.

At the outset of the second Grant administration, the *Tribune* was in a mood to accept gratefully any reformation that the General and his clique might offer, but skeptical of their will or ability to produce anything of value. Of the President's inaugural address, the paper said:

It is the utterance of a man of the best intentions profoundly desirous to govern wisely and justly, and profoundly ignorant of the means by which good government may be secured. . . . He promises little but what we heartily approve—little but what the *Tribune* will sustain during the coming term with its usual energy, no matter what the President may do.

The first year of Grant's second term gave no encouragement to the *Tribune* that any real change of heart had occurred in the leadership of the Republican Party. Congress, indeed, in a fit of piety following the wrath of the last campaign, had revoked its franking privilege—but in a year sought to regain it. Then the legislators proceeded to award themselves an increase of one-third their salaries—with back pay since the beginning of their term. In the *Tribune's* phrase, "The Franking Privilege was repealed in the day of the party's remorse, and the Salary Grab enacted in the reaction of complacent and self-satisfied virtue which followed."

Nor had the President gained wisdom under the reproaches of the Liberals. His new appointments were no better than the old, and every day brought out more clearly the evils of the latter. In 1874, one Simpson became Collector of the Port of Boston, to the scandal of the inhabitants. In the same year also, an investigation of the Treasury Department revealed gross fraud in the receipt of revenues; William A. Richardson, Boutwell's successor as Secretary of the Treasury, resigned, and the roll of Republican dishonor received the names of Sanborn and Jayne.

In policy, as well as personnel, the Administration was unfortunate. The old order of military control was maintained in the South. Louisiana, "a state waylaid and overpowered, a people oppressed and plundered," groaned under the regime of Governor W. P. Kellogg, while South Carolina conservatives were believed to be ready to offer their support to Grant for another term, if he would relieve them of some of the intolerable burden of their mockery of negro and carpetbag "government." James Shepherd Pike, late of the *Tribune* staff, in 1874 published an illuminating document on this situation in South Carolina, his famous survey, *The Prostrate State*.

But on this issue, Grant could at least claim the mandate of

1872. His second term saw another issue rise to commanding significance, one on which there was as yet no very clear expression of the popular will. It soon became a determining factor in the *Tribune's* judgment of party men and party measures, a touchstone of allegiance. This was the long vexed problem of the currency, which had raged in Grant's first four years, only to be obscured by moral issues and Reconstruction. When Boutwell left the Treasury, the number of greenbacks had actually increased somewhat.

To the *Tribune*, ardently desirous of a return to gold, this was an affront, but worse followed. In 1873 the credit structure collapsed and a prolonged and severe period of depression set in. With the diminution of buying power, contraction of the war-expanded currency was opposed and a counter-claim for an increase in the number of paper dollars was vigorously presented. Congress was greatly agitated, and in the spring of 1874 a bill was prepared, increasing the amount of greenbacks by some eighty million dollars.

Under the stress of the craving for inflation, "the brandy bottle" of the *Tribune*, party lines dissolved altogether; the nation was divided by sectional and economic interests. As Reid's paper pointed out, the greater part of the opposition to the inflation came from the "creditor states" of the Northeast. The *Tribune* took an uncompromising stand on the question, resisting any concession to soft-money sentiment on the theory that:

An increase in the number of greenbacks, however slight, would inevitably lead to ever greater expansion of the irredeemable currency, with consequent unsettling of values, destruction of business and ruin.

But beyond the question of expediency, the subject of the currency took on more of a moral than a legal status; expansion was seen as an attempt on the part of debtors to escape their just obligations by fraud. As John Hay wrote from Ohio in 1875, "Think of this state—with half the Republicans and all the Democrats inflationists at heart, and carrying on a campaign on the bald issue whether the nation shall be a liar and a thief or not."²

On this momentous question, the Republican Party, as Hay's remark indicates, was at least divided. In fact the leadership,

Grant's personal coterie, tended to be definitely inflationists—Morton, Logan, Butler, Cameron and Kelley all exhibited soft-money leanings. Only Conkling was on the *Tribune's* side. Grant temporized; to the joy and surprise of the *Tribune*, the President vetoed the inflation bill, only to assent to another which checked any attempt at resumption of specie payments indefinitely.

This was the state of Republican affairs by the middle of July, 1874. At the beginning of the year Reid had received a curious communication from his friend William Walter Phelps, Congressman from New Jersey:

Washington
February 13, 1874

Dear W. R.:

Member after member comes to me on the assumption that if I am not owner I am friend. To sum: They hate the *Times* since it has proved recreant to the Republican faith, bitterly. They would love the *Tribune*, and give it most zealous aid, if it would be Republican. It might lead the party, and have an influence and circulation unparalleled in journalism. They would want nothing more than a statement of future intention, not of past repentance. Say, e. g., "The *Tribune* under its present management has sought to maintain that independent position which would enable it without prejudice to criticize the acts of both parties. But blind and reprehensible as are many of the acts of the Republican party, it is still a great party, etc. As for the Democracy—salary grabber nominated for speaker, etc.—there isn't salt enough to save it, etc." What merit in their suggestions I cannot tell. I know they are sick of the *Times* and would like to rally round the *Tribune*. . . .³

Reid's private response to this "desire of the Republicans that the *Tribune* should give them half a chance to come back to it," was to assert his belief in the essential superiority of that party to its opponent. But he went on to say that he felt it would be "a dishonest thing" for "us to undertake to support men and measures we don't believe in" and "shockingly bad policy" to sacrifice an independent constituency to become the organ of a party which "gives more signs than ever before of going to pieces." As John Hay said, Reid "bited not" at the Republican bait.⁴

The public response of the *Tribune* to organization overtures was even more cutting. Editorially, the paper commenced a quest for "the lost party," the party which had promised reformation

of the ballot box, of the civil service, which had offered leadership toward resumption—and which had transformed none of these fair words into honest performance.

Should this party turn up anywhere no special reward is offered for it, but a great many people would like to know where it is, just to present their claims and find out when it will be convenient for them to—call again.

This was merely a more subtle manner of phrasing the thought with which Reid had closed his reply to Phelps:

. . . I should like it very much if our Republican friends would only rub the scales off their eyes far enough to see that we have done and are doing nothing inconsistent with the most absolute fealty to the Republican principles which they learned from the *Tribune* and which this day have no more staunch defense than its columns afford.⁵

The situation, as far as the *Tribune* and the Republicans were concerned, was that the strong meat of doctrine resided in the paper and not in the party. The latter, in fact, lacked principle, policy, leadership and all cohesion, "except that it flies the flag of a party which once did good and honest work and deserved to be trusted"—like Captain Kidd. As for the Democrats, they lacked even the flag. True, they were used "as a scourge, a whip of small cords to drive the money changers out," but the *Tribune* had no confidence, and believed that the people at large had but little, in their scarifying tool as an instrument of constructive labor.

A third party was an ever-present possibility. In November of 1873, Charles Francis Adams, Jr., proposed an organization of the "leading men of discontented mind" to "influence events during this period of party disintegration." Reid was receptive, and a list was compiled of the prospective dwellers in the cave of Adul-lam (an allusion very popular in those days). It included Adams, Reid, David A. Wells, Murat Halstead, E. L. Godkin, Watterson, Schurz, Evarts, Isaac Sherman, William Orton, J. D. Cox, Sam. Cox, Edgar Wells, Phelps, "Ike" Bromley and Charles Nordhoff. The movement barely was under way when rumors "leaked" into the press, and talk of a new party was in the air.⁶

Reid's conception of the value of this benevolent conspiracy

was strictly in line with Adams's prospectus. He objected to any more active participation or organization than was implied by frequent dinners and discussion, keeping alive the spirit of rebellion and maintaining a constant threat of a sizable and influential block of independent votes hanging over the major organizations. New parties, said the *Tribune*, are not manufactured by the confabulations of political leaders—adding that the older groups were probably devoutly thankful for this fact. The Third Party was a bugaboo, as yet. However, since the existing parties refused to take a definite stand on any major issue, with the possible exception of Reconstruction, "there is time enough, yet, . . . for the people to take the matter in hand." The one solvent for the muddle, in the *Tribune's* opinion, was a strong personality who would focus the current discontent into a workable program, and swing the elements of Liberal Republicanism into the balance.

Never sat party ties so lightly; never was occasion so ripe; the time calls for a leader. Who will answer?

For a time, it appeared that the voice of Samuel J. Tilden intoned a response. One of the finest intellects of the New York Bar, and a consummate politician, the polished resident of 15 Gramercy Park had reaped the political fruits of the *Times's* exposure of the Tweed Ring. He stood for Reform, had courage and intelligence, and in 1874 headed the Democratic ticket in New York State. The Republican incumbent at Albany, General John A. Dix, had performed well in office, and stood for reëlection. At the outset Reid did not recognize in his friend Tilden any very definite Messianic stigmata and was somewhat perplexed. As he wrote to the editor of the *Buffalo Courier*:

I don't know as to the political outlook. The case is in a nutshell. Both the State candidates are good men; both the parties need black eyes. You know the judgment of the alarmed negro who, when informed by the camp meeting preacher that the road on his right hand led to hell fire, while the road on his left led to damnation, decided that it was about time for dis nigger to take to de woods.⁷

Reid, however, did not "take to de woods"; he found that there were distinctions between hell fire and damnation. The most alarm-

ing manifestation of General Grant's regime, to many of his contemporaries, was the apparent intention of his supporters to make it perpetual. The *Herald* had raised the cry of "Caesarism" in the fall of '73, and while Thomas Nast responded with merry satires on Caesar's Ghost disturbing Bennett and Reid on the ramparts of the Elsinore of Park Row, the shout would not down. It crept into practical politics and agitated conventions. The *Tribune* firmly announced that the Praetorian Guard must go, and Reid found the state elections of 1874 an ideal time to make his protest felt.

The *Tribune* remained uncommitted until the platforms of both parties were in evidence. The Democrats easily denounced the Third Term movement; the Republicans were silent, and, though Dix invited the Liberals, through Reid, to rejoin their old allegiance, he did not placate them until too late by the practical renunciation of Grant's leadership which the Independents demanded. The *Tribune* swung the weight of its influence to Tilden, subordinating all issues to that of Grantism. The result was a sweeping Democratic victory.

In the campaign, Tilden had served to all intents as the whip of small cords for the chastening of Grant. But Reid saw in him a larger usefulness; from the date of Tilden's inaugural the *Tribune* and its editor gave much attention to the fashioning of the Democratic Governor into the looked-for leader. It was only by this means that the Republicans could be forced to clean house, only thus that the Liberals would be able to find alternatives to which they could turn without stultifying previous acts and declarations.

Tilden was amenable. His message at the beginning of 1875 was a declaration of principles which made him eminently acceptable to the group which the *Tribune* represented. Though worded so as to apply only to state matters, the section on currency was reassuring to the hard-money men whom Grant's vacillation repelled. Moreover, Tilden, in a passage which Reid himself had written, accepted for his party the issues of the war—without reservations.⁸ In the acceptance of Vallandigham's New Departure and of Greeley's anti-inflation sentiment, Tilden was on

solid ground as far as the *Tribune's* many subscribers were concerned.

Tilden's practice was as sound as his precept. While in office at Albany, with the *Tribune's* generous support and applause, he made a clean sweep of the Canal Ring, a shocking incubus. The active intelligence in the Governor's chair was of national importance at the end of the year, and no small part of the credit of this record must be assigned to the *Tribune* and its editor. A commanding figure had been reared to set off against Grant.

Events had favored the growth of Samuel Tilden. The path of the national Administration was littered with an increasing amount of unsavory debris as it drew toward the crossroads of 1876. Benjamin Bristow, a brilliant and honest man, followed Richardson into the Treasury. He conducted an investigation into the payment of the internal revenue by distillers, and found a wholesale fraud. The shame reached to the White House itself, to Grant's private secretary, General Samuel D. Babcock. The evidence was convincingly presented, but the result was a complete subversion of justice. Babcock went scot-free, and those convicted were speedily pardoned, while Secretary Bristow resigned in disgust.

Then followed a belated echo of the *Tribune's* activities of 1872, which besmirched the Cabinet itself. Secretary of War William W. Belknap, guilty of a cheap and mean fraud in the disposal of trading stations at army posts, anticipated impeachment by resignation, which Grant accepted. A Minister to the Court of St. James employed his dignity to aid in selling fraudulent stocks, and whispers of another Credit Mobilier ran through Congress as the Pacific Mail transactions were investigated. The bill which the *Tribune* had represented the country as anxious to present to the party in power was lengthy indeed.

The *Tribune* was active during this disgraceful period. Its editor was summoned to Washington for the Belknap case and the Pacific Mail transactions. Exposed tricksters attempted vengeance. "Boss" Shepherd of Washington had Reid arrested for criminal libel during the Pacific Mail business, and only the immunity of a Congressional subpoena saved the editor from the

dangers of a trial in the Boss's courts. The *Tribune's* publication of enlightening incidentals, in connection with the exposure of Minister Schenck's interest in the Emma Mine, led to a suit for \$100,000, instituted by Schenck's principal, one Trenor W. Parke.

Nevertheless, the *Tribune* refused to renounce its "stake in the Republican party," despite the "worthless loafers and pettifogging shysters" which infested it. The paper still hoped for a reform, a revival of the authentic Republicanism which had abolished slavery and saved the Union. In January, 1876, Tilden made a masterly bid for the Presidential nomination in a message to the state legislature which dealt almost entirely with national issues. The *Tribune* could not cavil at the plea for sound currency and reform in administration, but the close of its editorial comment on the message is significant:

Whether Gov. Tilden's party is disposed to march in the path he indicates or the best hopes of the nation lie with a reformed Republicanism, it is perhaps too soon yet to determine.

The *Tribune's* reasons for hope in the Republican Party were based on certain phenomena which had appeared along with the discouraging symptoms of the fraud exposures. A growing group of organization men seemed to recognize the necessity of house-cleaning, despite the dead weight of opposition from the White House. Even Grant seemed to have a muddled recognition of the necessity "to unload." The flesh was still weak, but the spirit grew more willing. Most important, probably, was the increasing realization that the Republicans as a whole were more inclined to resumption of specie payments than their opponents—a factor which weighed heavily with the *Tribune*. This was demonstrated when, under pressure of an approaching Democratic legislature, the Republicans jammed through a bill in the last hours of the session of 1875, providing for resumption in 1879. Thus, in a measure, the Republicans captured the leadership of the gold contingent.

1876, the Centennial year, brought another Presidential campaign. Seldom has the public interest in potential candidates evinced itself so early, or been sustained at such a keen pitch. Both parties were on their mettle; the organization ranks on either side, sadly disturbed by events since 1868, were acutely conscious of a

threatening mass of independents, standing by to judge their actions and swing the scales. For all the scandal of the years since the Civil War, the pre-election campaign of 1876 was an impressive demonstration of the essential health of American democracy.

The leaders of the sturdy, though disorganized, remnant of Liberals which formed the nucleus of the independents, met in conference in May, 1876, to lay down principles of action. A platform of reform was adopted and a convention called, with the proviso that if either of the great parties indicated a substantial reformation, the chairman, Ethan Allen, might annul the call. Various possible candidates were discussed; Benjamin H. Bristow was most highly thought of, with Tilden and C. F. Adams favored. Thomas F. Bayard, Allen G. Thurman, Elihu Washburne and Rutherford B. Hayes were also approved. A disgruntled ward leader commented that the Liberals "have reenacted the moral law and the ten commandments for a platform, and have demanded an angel of light as the nominee for President." But the *Tribune* retorted:

If either organization is to reform itself and renew its strength, it will accomplish that result only by recalling to its ranks the "soreheads" and "college professors" whom the men inside politics now affect to regard with so much contempt.

The *Tribune* naturally examined carefully the crop of Presidential possibilities. Like many of the Liberals, it felt that Charles Francis Adams would be the ideal choice, but Adams had been, in Reid's view, injured by the injudicious support of the *Springfield Republican*. Bristow the paper held too little experienced in politics, but of Tilden the *Tribune* said: "The feeling of the people is that the country would be safe in his hands as the executive."

Yet the most important of Republican possibilities was none of these, but a man with whose political career the *Tribune* was to be closely allied. This was James Gillespie Blaine, Senator from Maine. In the campaign of 1876 Blaine's position in the *Tribune* was equivocal. There were several points of contact between the two, in addition to the personal friendship existing between Blaine and Reid. Blaine was a foe of Conkling, a strong advocate of protection, sound on the money question, and he had been one of

the more moderate Radicals of early Reconstruction days. But Blaine was a firm organization man, a "practical" politician, and he opened his pre-convention campaign in January, 1876, with a revival of war hatreds that could only be distasteful to the *Tribune*. He moved in Congress that Jefferson Davis be excluded from a general amnesty on the grounds of complicity in the "crimes of Andersonville."

Blaine was an attractive figure for all that; a showy orator and a "magnetic" personality. His Andersonville speech, if it antagonized the Liberals, attracted favorable attention from the die-hards of the G. A. R., and he was probably the outstanding candidate from the regular ranks to appeal for the nomination. The *Tribune* canvassed his growing strength with the detachment of a polling clerk, but did not escape the insinuation that it had selected Blaine as its candidate. This was vigorously denied in public; Reid's personal sentiments are best expressed in a letter of March 14th to John Hay, already a zealous partizan of the Man from Maine:

My dear Hay:

What do you think of Blaine now? It seems to me that the tide is now running very strongly, both East and West, in favor of Bristow, and that if Bowles hadn't so vulgarized the name of Adams we might even have a chance for such a ticket as Adams and Bristow. Still, this is surface enthusiasm, while far down below the surface Blaine's machinery is at work, fastening the delegates. If Blaine should be the candidate on the one side, however, and Tilden on the other, Blaine would probably find that the odium of the Belknap business and his own leadership in the party without protest against the course of the Administration, would carry him down. He could not carry New York, and I don't believe he could be elected. If he had only done one or two plucky things instead of being forever a partizan,—he is an abler man than Bristow and would make a better President. Personally, it would be an easy thing to support him. Indeed up to this time it was the easiest thing to do, but I don't believe I am mistaken as to the set of the present popular tide.

Faithfully yours,
Whitelaw Reid.⁹

Thus it may be seen that at this point in the careers of Blaine and Reid, the ground, though ripe for an alliance, had as yet borne no harvest. The editor's estimate of the politician was kinder than that of many Independents, but ran along the same lines.

Just as the conventions were about to meet, however, an episode occurred which was to affect Blaine's course, and ultimately that of the *Tribune*, profoundly.

It will be remembered that, in 1872, the *Tribune* had made sensational charges concerning Blaine's railroad transactions. The charges could not be proved, and were fully retracted. Blaine had also been listed among the Congressional stockholders of the Credit Mobilier; this had been disproved, and the *Tribune* congratulated him thereon. In June of 1876, a new inquisition was made into Blaine's financial affairs, probably inspired by his outstanding position as a Republican candidate and his Andersonville speech.

The roots of the new accusation went back to 1869, when Blaine, as Speaker of the House, made a ruling favorable to a certain railroad—the Little Rock and Fort Smith. Subsequently Blaine entered into financial arrangements with this road through one Warren Fisher. The matter was at least questionable upon grounds of both public and private morality. Blaine pointed by letter to his action as Speaker in what might, not uncharitably, be interpreted as a bid for preferential treatment, and assured the railroad men that he would not be a "dead-head" in the enterprise. On the other hand, he had purchased first mortgage bonds of the concern, receiving an equal amount of land bonds and common stock as bonus; the not uncommon "three for one" system. Blaine retailed his bonus to neighbors, and the railroad failed. Now—whether his constituents and clients lost in his deal or whether Blaine made their losses good at his own expense, whether these transactions aided the road in marketing securities, or merely lined his own pocket—at all events Blaine pointed to the sales as evidence of his ability to aid the company in a purely private capacity.

But Blaine's actions gave these disputed points an even more sinister aspect. The Democratic onslaught brought forward a former bookkeeper of Warren Fisher—James Mulligan—who claimed to have copies of letters proving the charges against the Maine Senator. He came to Washington with his packet—and the accused lost his head. Blaine and Mulligan gave conflicting accounts of what occurred, but at best, the letters were taken from Mulligan

by a species of trickery. Blaine had them and refused to surrender to the investigating committee.

Immediately there was a furious uproar. Blaine's friends were panic-stricken, his enemies jubilant. The *Tribune* expressed a fear lest "some of the mud . . . might stick," and demanded that Blaine surrender the letters. Whereupon, Blaine arose in Congress and dramatically read an expurgated version of the story related above.

The drama of it caught the public emotions. Blaine stock, apparently down to zero, rebounded to par. Even Charles Nordhoff, a Liberal journalist with leanings toward Adams, was forced to count Blaine in on the canvass again. As to the precise interpretation of the story contained in the letters, Nordhoff felt that they showed only "some imprudence,"¹⁰ while the *Tribune*, agreeing, predicted that the mass of the public would be even less critical. It would not assess the charges, but pay tribute to the "fighting qualities" of the man. On June 14, the paper opined that Blaine would surely be nominated, and went on to discuss Hayes and Bristow as possible Vice-Presidents. The *Tribune* was evidently ready to ratify this choice, though without great enthusiasm. It had found the leader, but was not yet convinced that he was ideal.

The Republican National Convention surprised the *Tribune*—and most of the rest of the country as well—by presenting a slate of Rutherford B. Hayes and William A. Wheeler. Yet it was a ticket the *Tribune* could easily endorse. The paper admitted that Blaine's candidacy would have necessarily been a defensive one, whereas the upright if unmagnetic Hayes, "a man of whom it is impossible to say a word of evil," was "not only above reproach but above suspicion." Both of the national candidates were uncompromising resumptionists; though the platform was weak on the currency, the men were strong. The *Tribune* was well satisfied with the Republican showing, and, though refusing to commit itself until the opposition had had its chance, the paper was evidently but slightly interested in the actions of the Democracy.

There were three main reasons for the *Tribune's* bias in the premises. First, and probably foremost, must be the paper's long and honorable association with the Republican Party; a connection which the *Tribune* never considered relinquished by its stand

since 1872. Other things being equal, the *Tribune* preferred the Republican tradition to that of its opponent. Specifically, the Republicans were more desirable allies because of their more vigorous prosecution of resumption (the tariff was almost a dead issue in '76) and because, in their brief period of legislative power, the Democrats had made but a poor showing, in the *Tribune's* opinion. "Blunders and mud-slinging" coupled with "the most indecent scramble for office that the country remembers for many years" was the paper's version of the Democratic record. In fine:

In the sixteen years of its reverses it has done nothing as a party to entitle itself to popular confidence in its ability, honesty or capacity.

The *Tribune* was thus almost completely alienated from the Democracy before that party went into convention. There the work was finished: a platform which demanded both resumption and the repeal of the existing resumption act, a ticket which bracketed hard-money Tilden ("an admirable candidate on a bad platform") with T. A. Hendricks of Ohio, honest and highly esteemed but "one of the most conspicuous of the paper-money statesman"—that was not an exhibition to tempt Reid and his paper. The reaction was immediate.

We have cordially recognized Gov. Tilden's great services to the State and his eminent fitness for the highest office in the land, and we rejoice that the Democratic party has been driven to nominate so admirable a candidate. But yoked with Mr. Hendricks and obstructed by a bad platform independents cannot take the risk of voting for him. . . .

The Republican professions are weak, but they are sound as far as they go, while the character of the Republican candidates gives them an authority which they have not when standing alone. . . .

Other Liberal Republicans took the same position. Chairman Allen came out openly for Hayes and revoked the call for the Liberal convention—not without some protest from men like Parke Godwin. The period of open insurgency was ended.

The *Tribune* thus became once more a Republican supporter, albeit still somewhat critical. Fortunately, Hayes, who had been a Liberal at heart in the abortive revolution of 1872, proved a strong candidate in the reform campaign. His letter of acceptance

embodied the same promise of Civil Service Reform and especially of moderation toward the South that had emanated from Cincinnati four years earlier. This made the transition easy for the Liberals; indeed, they were now the dominant faction. Nevertheless, while the reforming leaders flocked to Hayes, the struggle was a bitter one. The *Tribune* warned the party against overconfidence, and on the night of November 7, it seemed that these warnings had been but too well justified and too little heeded.

The following morning, William E. Chandler, that devious and canny Senator from New Hampshire, read a sad tale in his early edition of the *Tribune*. Tilden was elected by 188 electoral votes to 141 for Hayes; 34 still in doubt. On the editorial page was a sarcastic little summary that rubbed salt in the wounds of the battered campaigner:

1. Gov. Tilden had too many votes.
2. The general dissatisfaction with the Administration was not quieted by the nomination of Gov. Hayes. Too many people believed that his Administration would be merely a continuation of Grant's.
3. Hard times. People wanted a change and thought perhaps that turning out the party in power might give it.
4. The Democrats used the best intellects in their party to address their best arguments to the intelligence of voters. The Republican canvass ran more in party grooves, and depended less on arguments than on prejudice.
5. Gov. Hayes didn't have votes enough.

Chandler pulled his hat over his eyes and, swathed in greatcoat and cape, trudged disconsolately toward the Republican National headquarters. But there he met John C. Reid, news editor of the *Times*, who excitedly informed him that his paper had reason to believe that Hayes had 181 votes, that Florida was still doubtful and would swing the election. Immediately the two conferred with the weary Chairman, Zach Chandler, and the wires buzzed with the frantic question, "Can you hold your state?"¹¹

On November 9, the *Tribune* adjusted its figures to meet those of the *Times*, and "visiting statesmen" hurriedly packed their bags to observe events in the Deep South. What transpired there is still mysterious in detail but clear in mass. Amid fraud and violence in plenty, Republican Returning Boards in Louisiana

and Florida recorded a verdict for their side. Protests ensued, and at long last the problem was visited upon Congress.

It was a pretty puzzle. The function of opening the votes is constitutionally vested in the President of the Senate—in this case, a Republican. There is no provision in the acts of the founders to provide for the contingency which now arose, of adjudging the validity of the regularly transmitted electoral vote of a state. The Republicans naturally clung to the strict wording of the document, and declared that the decision of the Returning Board was final; that nothing remained for Congress but to register its formal attestation. Democratic organs, like the *World*, on the other hand, avowed that it was the duty of Congress, both Houses thereof, to sit in judgment on the returns. If their verdict was a deadlock (a foregone conclusion with a Democratic House and a Republican Senate), the House was to exercise its prerogative of electing the President, as in cases where no majority had been secured in the electoral college. The Senate was to be permitted to elect a Vice-President.

The grave issues at stake, and the conflicting interpretations of the enigmatic Constitution, threw the country into an unwholesome ferment. Tilden's huge popular majority gave his supporters the moral advantage; legally, on the face of things, the Republicans were in a better strategic position. Fiery Colonel Watterson threatened a visitation of "100,000 unarmed men" to petition Congress, while dark rumors ran that the petitioners would not be weaponless. It was one of the most serious crises in the government of this country, comparable to the situation in the frenzied years following the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

During it all, the *Tribune* maintained a realistic calm. The election of neither candidate, it proclaimed, would be as serious as fraud in a Presidential title. Both parties were unfortunately open to suspicion on this score, continued the paper, and the hasty departure southward of certain politicians was to be deprecated. Meanwhile—calmness and lack of prejudice was essential. Quite naturally, the *Tribune* supported the claim of Hayes, though not without some searching of editorial hearts. Isaac Bromley, for instance, was far from convinced of the justice of his paper's position; he first abstained from referring to the matter

in his editorials, and then addressed remonstrances to his chief. Reid responded with an explanation of certain Democratic practices which were later to become notorious, and Bromley returned to the fold.¹²

Congress settled the dilemma by a compromise which characteristically pleased no one. An Electoral Commission was set up, which the Democrats hoped would give the balance of power to Judge David Davis, an independent Democrat. At the last moment, however, the worthy Justice was translated to the Senate, and the decisive post fell to a Republican jurist. The *Tribune* and the pro-Tilden *Sun* both denounced the compromise as a "perversion of the Constitution," the former asserting that:

A mode of counting good enough for Washington, Adams and Madison ought to be good enough for the men of 1877.

Nevertheless, the Commission went into action, and by a straight party vote pronounced Hayes President.

Meanwhile, the friends of Hayes had been careful to placate the Southern Democrats. The "good sense and prudence of Gov. Tilden," in the *Tribune's* phrase, or what his supporters considered lack of courage and decision, left the Southerners little to hope for from their own candidate. The *Tribune* had early advised Hayes to assure these men of the intentions expressed in his letter of acceptance, pledging the abandonment of Federal interference in Southern state governments, and thereby "taking from the Southern white citizens their last and only excuse for acting with the Democrats." This was done; by a secret agreement, leading Southerners withdrew their opposition.¹³

But Hayes's position was still unenviable. On March 3, 1877, the day that the decision of the Electoral Commission was announced, the *Sun* came out somberly bedecked in the black borders of inverted column rules. At the top of the editorial page appeared this solemn pronouncement:

These are days of humiliation, shame and mourning for every patriotic American. A man whom the people rejected at the polls has been declared President of the United States through processes of fraud. A cheat is to sit in the seat of George Washington.

Let every upright citizen gird himself up for the work of repressing this

monstrous iniquity. No truce with the guilty conspirators! No rest for them and no mercy, till their political punishment and destruction are completed.

And this grave warning in the *Tribune* greeted the new Executive on his inaugural:

For a period of four years he can hardly count on a single peaceful day, . . . so bitter will be the political hostility which he must encounter and so intricate the task of pacification to which with an honorable courage he has devoted himself from the beginning. From his enemies he can expect no fairness—happy above mortals will he be if he is never wounded in the house of his friends.

The truth of this prophecy was soon dismally apparent. The enmity of the Democrats was to be more or less taken for granted; discontent with the President in his own party flowed from scarcely less obvious sources. On February 21, 1877, Whitelaw Reid addressed the President-elect on behalf of that Liberal opinion which the *Tribune* so ably and so forcefully represented, stating what this group expected in national policy:

Above all things we hope that it will be broad and National rather than narrowly partizan. We hope for that genuine Civil Service reform, which consists in not turning people out of office merely to make places for other people—in making no change save for cause. We hope for a policy that may retrieve the errors and disgrace of Republican dealings with the South—precisely in accordance with the admirable tone of your letter of acceptance. We very much hope that you may find it possible, as an earnest of this spirit, to make a place for at least one good representative of the South in your cabinet, and we think especially well of Lamar and Randall Gibson. We should not groan if such an appointment were to be followed by the downfall of such Southern State Governments as can only be propped up by bayonets—provided their downfall does not involve a practical reënslavement of the blacks.¹⁴

Hayes was a Liberal, and a forthright Liberal. He clung to the letter of his platform, his message of acceptance and his inaugural speech—all of which involved a program closely in line with that which Reid had sketched above. Moreover, Hayes selected William M. Evarts for Secretary of State, a choice which the *Tribune* had strenuously urged. Carl Schurz was named Secretary of the Interior and David M. Key, a Southerner, became Postmaster General.

The Independents who had followed Greeley and the *Tribune* into the Cave of Adullam were triumphant.

Naturally this displeased the ever-faithful. Blaine and Conkling were both annoyed at the Cabinet selections, and the Southern policy of the Administration transformed an internal feud into something very like open warfare. The Federal troops, who though scant in numbers (barely a score in Columbia), represented all the awe and majesty of the National authority, left the capitols of South Carolina and Louisiana to the will of the inhabitants of those well-plundered states. Instantly the regimes of Chamberlain and Packard collapsed, and the Democrats took over the reins.

To the South, this meant awakening from a sordid nightmare; to partizan Republicans and carpetbaggers it was the end of a beautiful dream of continued power. Men high in the party denounced the President. W. E. Chandler in a pamphlet accused Hayes of invalidating his own election by his refusal to sustain the verdict of the Returning Boards in the case of the ousted governors. The latter shouted "ingratitude" and "treachery" and drew ominous pictures of the negro under Bourbon rule. Blaine orated on the menace of a solid South and spoke vaguely but ominously of designs on Mexico, of a recrudescence of the spirit of the Ostend Manifesto. The patchwork reunion of the last national convention seemed ready to fall in ruins.

The *Tribune* stoutly championed the debated measures, earning from D. H. Chamberlain the title of "one of the chief supporters of President Hayes's Southern policy." The paper justified its policy on the twin grounds of general welfare and party expediency:

At the end of the war the Republican Party had full control of the entire South. For many years it carried every election, by the aid of the appliances which President Hayes is blamed for discarding. Every year the application of the force policy became more difficult and the limits of Federal authority were more violently stretched. Then one State after another fell into Democratic hands, and when Mr. Hayes came into office nothing was left of the Republican Party in the South except the skeletons of two State Administrations which could not stand up without the support of the soldiers, and fell to pieces as soon as the soldiers marched to their barracks. Meanwhile the finances of the South had become nearly hopeless, its industries were prostrate, its local governments

were public scandals, its freedmen remained ignorant and poor, and even the public peace could not be preserved. . . .

In plain truth, if the Republican Party of the South has been destroyed, it was destroyed by Gen. Grant. If it can be revived, the common-sense policy announced by President Hayes is the only thing to revive it.

But Hayes's attempt had split his following, and the breach was widened by the President's treatment of the delicate question of patronage. And here even the *Tribune* was somewhat estranged.

The Civil Service was a hotly debated topic in the half-century following the Civil War. As we have seen, Reid and his paper were strong advocates of a purified Service, and much of the animus against Grant was based on his misuse of the appointing power. Yet, Reid was practical enough to realize the power of office to cement political parties. Furthermore, Reid mistrusted, and the *Tribune* reflected this mistrust, the ability of examinations and rules of seniority to select fit candidates. Summed up at the end of Hayes's first year, the *Tribune's* attitude was as follows:

. . . The *Tribune*, as earnest as any of them for substantial improvement in the service, but taking no stock in any of the spelling-book and geography methods, insisted that the real secret of the whole business was in having an appointing power moved by an honest and unselfish purpose, and governed by sound common sense; in other words, that the only practical way to reform the Civil Service was to begin at the head and elect a President who could be trusted to make such appointments as would, without the intervention of rules, or systems, or boards, or commissions, themselves insure the reforms demanded.

Hayes's conduct of the patronage was not, in the *Tribune's* eyes, either too honest or too dishonest, it was merely maladroit. In the first place, he too openly paid the debts incurred in the election controversy, to the scandal of the reformers. Then, his friends in Ohio were sumptuously disposed of—and John Hay, not of the number, shared in the annoyance felt by party men in other states.¹⁵ By July, 1877, the *Tribune* spoke of the average citizen as standing "aghast when they see some of his appointments," and wondering whether it is infirmity of purpose or lack of information which makes him act at times like "a trading politician."

Such political jobbing stood in greater relief by reason of the

President's profession of reform, and such radical steps as the General Order of June, 1877, which forbade Government office-holders to participate in any partizan activity. The *Tribune* carried a sarcastic series from the pen of Gail Hamilton, conceived in the spirit of the old organization, and pointing gleefully to the many discrepancies between Presidential principles and Hayes's practice. Reid did not wholly endorse these articles, but he felt that the Administration was "drifting" instead of making a clear-cut compromise between its ideals and the necessities of the political situation. And to drift was dangerous to the party.

This was obviously true. In New York State, the Civil Service issue brought on a critical condition to add to the dissension over the Southern policy. The *Tribune* could not approve of Conkling's exhortation of the reformers in the State Convention of 1877, which drew the famous parallel between reform and patriotism as the "last refuge of scoundrels." The convention, said the paper, was inspired by the same spirit "that animated the administration of President Grant."

But on the other hand, neither could the *Tribune* approve of the President's summary dismissal of A. B. Cornell and Chester A. Arthur from their posts in the Customhouse, though both were Conkling men. The action could only intensify the feud. "Such a contest, at such a time—is that good sense or a wise use of a great power?"

"At such a time"—the *Tribune* was now passionately intent on unifying the Republican Party, for underneath the strife of factions great events were stirring. The depression which followed 1873 had trailed its long way through ever-increasing suffering, and social and financial heresies were becoming more radical and abundant. Among the symptoms of the prolonged deflationary period, was the rise of a new theory of currency expansion, menacing the financial order as it existed on the formal basis of gold.

Previous to 1873, this country had been on a bi-metallic standard; gold and silver were both freely coined at a fixed ratio. In the panic year, the market price of silver had reached a point so far above the coinage ratio that the metal had been unobtrusively legislated out of the monetary system, except as used in small change. So indifferent was the country at large to this "crime of

'73" that an editorial of the *Tribune* some years later referred to the "prospect" of demonetization in terms which give rise to the awful suspicion that the editors were as yet unaware that the event had already taken place in this country.

They were not long in ignorance. Silver coinage was greatly restricted throughout the world—in Germany and the Latin Monetary Union, for instance—in the years following '73. Then came the discovery of huge new silver lodes, depressing the market price below the old coinage ratio. The interests of Western miners in dear silver and of Western farmers in cheap currency found a harmonious union, and what the *Tribune* referred to as "The Cloud in the West" began to take shape.

The first bolt from this cloud was the Bland Silver Bill, which set the coinage ratio of silver at a figure which made one dollar of the white metal worth 93¢ in gold. Specifically, the *Tribune* asserted that tremendous credit structures had made an increase in specie inoperative as an influence on prices; more specifically still it believed that the Bland bill would cause the flight of gold, interfere with the funding of the debt, affect adversely the Latin Monetary Union, and constitute a partial repudiation of the nation's obligations. In place of this bill, the *Tribune* proposed the free and unlimited coinage of silver at its fluctuating market ratio.

But beyond these immediate considerations, the *Tribune* viewed the Silver agitation as a part of that ominous spirit which it detected in the violent strikes and radical panaceas of the later 'seventies, a spirit which the paper interpreted in terms of revolution and of the French Commune. The influence of this interpretation on the social philosophy of editor and newspaper will be dealt with at length in another chapter; the political result was to send the *Tribune* over bodily to the Republican Party as the most efficacious instrument for the preservation of the existing order. Silver and inflation were not Democratic monopolies, but the party in opposition had at least a large share of the adherents of these ideas. Hence to harmonize the Republicans, under the Administration or in its despite, became the mission of the *Tribune*. And the moral crusade of the period of insurgency was forced into a secondary position.

Wracked by dissension, this task might have been impossible,

had it not been for a Democratic onslaught which united the warring factions. But it was given to Reid's paper to provide ammunition for the defense—so effectively as to repel the onslaught, and, incidentally, bring surpassing fame to the *Tribune*.

The Democracy, though outwardly acquiescent in the decision of the Electoral Commission, were still seething over the Great Fraud. Some of the party were disposed to shelve Tilden; but the *Tribune*, in February of 1878, looked for "that discreet and clear-headed old gentleman" and found his absence from the political scene intriguing:

But by and by, when the time comes, he is quite likely to put in an appearance, and mildly suggest that, the Southern question being disposed of, the currency question being one upon which no Western or Southern Democrat can carry enough Northern states to elect him, there remains only the single issue to make the contest on—that he has been the victim of fraud, and must be vindicated.

The Democratic grand strategy took this precise form shortly thereafter. On May 14, 1878, the House, controlled by that party, appointed a committee to inquire into the alleged frauds of 1876.

At this renewal of the attack on Hayes's title, the *Tribune* waxed exceeding wrath. It charged a plot to oust Hayes and whitewash Democratic iniquities. The Potter Committee was to be a "committee of scavengers." "The existence of such a party as the Democratic again proves itself to be," continued the paper, setting up a prudent backfire, "is a greater danger to the country than can come from the errors of any law-abiding party."

By joint resolution, Congress limited the action of the Potter Committee by the acceptance of the verdict of the Electoral Commission as final. Hayes was secure for the duration of his term and the *Tribune* saluted the collapse of the plot. Nevertheless, the investigation was a patent attempt to provide material for the coming campaign, and the Republicans were on the alert to discover an antidote.

It required some temerity on the part of the Democrats to rouse the sleeping dogs of fraud. During the tumultuous session of the legislature, following the disputed election, a Senatorial Committee had subpoenaed vast masses of telegrams passing between political agents of either party. Among the rest were numerous

dispatches in cipher, bearing on the Oregon situation. In that state, one of the three electors, a Republican, had been declared incompetent by reason of holding a minor government position. The Democrats made valiant attempts to substitute his defeated opponent, and the troubled water permitted many intrigues.

The Democratic cipher chanced to be that of a business house, and the key was supplied to the *Detroit Post*. It was simple: the word desired was located in a certain dictionary, and the word occupying the same position four pages back was written down. The receiver reversed this process.

This key showed that a Democratic agent had offered to purchase an elector for \$10,000, spot cash. Colonel Pelton, Tilden's nephew and private secretary, refused, but offered slightly more on a contingent basis. An agreement was reached, but through delays in transmission, the deal fell through.

This rather unsavory episode had been hotly discussed in the early months of 1877, and would seem to indicate that the Democrats came into court with somewhat soiled hands. For all that, on August 3, the former editor of the *World*, Manton Marble, chose to make a very self-righteous communication to the *Sun*. Marble had been one of Tilden's "visiting statesmen" in Florida, and his letter aroused great interest. Couched in Marble's usual opulent style and pitched to a key of high moral indignation, the letter spoke of Tilden as "always standing fast in the citadel of power, the keen bright sunlight of publicity." Though "traces of money payment" were "darkly visible to the Potter Committee," and Returning Board certificates had been openly on sale in the Deep South,

. . . it was not there and thus that Mr. Tilden sought to compass the defeat of the Republican conspiracy. . . . I apologize to Governor Tilden for confronting his character with the morally impossible.

Unknown to Marble, however, a strange train of events had begun after the Senate Committee had completed its ineffectual labors. The subpoenaed telegrams had been ordered returned to the Western Union for destruction, and many had been so returned. But some time later Geo. C. Bullock, a messenger of the committee, appeared to Congressman Evans. Bullock had just

been appointed to the consulate at Cologne, and his conscience was burdened by a huge bundle of impounded dispatches. "He said that they had been kicked about the committee room, and that they ought to be taken care of as they might prove valuable."

Evans did not pry into his responsibility, but turned it over to Third Assistant Postmaster General Thomas J. Brady. The latter investigated and discovered many dispatches, chiefly in cipher, to and from 15 Gramercy Square, the Tilden home. Hale of Maine winded the find and reported it to the energetic W. E. Chandler, who had long chafed under the supposed destruction of the Democratic telegrams. He went to Brady, made copies of the dispatches, and deposited most of them secretly on the desk of General Butler, member of the Potter Committee!

Inspired by rumors of Marble's magnificently ill-timed outburst, Chandler wrote to Whitelaw Reid on August 7:

My dear Mr. Reid:

I have not seen Mr. M. Marble's last revelations; but I think it would be a good time for you to ask him to explain some of the telegrams which are among those which General Butler laid before the Potter Committee at Washington the other day; (with multitudes of others—of C. W. Woolley's, J. F. Coyle's *et id omne genus*).

I send you herewith copies of some, which you may have copied, and return to me those which I send you (17 pieces of paper embracing 27 despatches). If I were you I would not publish them all, as news items, but work them into an editorial or editorials on Marble's letter. By alternately giving one not in cipher and then one in cipher much amusement might be created.

One serious matter. Marble may be made, and I think is, responsible for the Cronin-Oregon fraud. He was in constant telegraphic communication with Pelton on the subject and tried to make us all miserable on the way home from Florida by showing us his despatches. I interpret the cipher despatch to him from K., Dec. 6th, as announcing the success of the Oregon job.

Yours truly,
Wm. E. Chandler.¹⁶

On this modest stock-in-trade, and limited program, the *Tribune* built up one of the greatest journalistic triumphs of the age. Reid took Chandler's advice, and presented the enigmatic documents as commentaries on texts selected from the gospel according to Marble. Was this the "keen, bright sunlight of publicity"?

Absolutely Petersburg can procure be Copenhagen may Thomas prompt Edinburgh must if river take be you less London Thames will.

And when "E. June" was "imperatively needed to prevent fall and involving Bath and Cuba," was that one of the "traces of money payment"? What meant these strange names? "Who," for instance, "was Moses?"

Verily the trail of the Oregon serpent seems to be over Florida. . . . Will Mr. Marble explain?

Mr. Marble would not. Nor would Mr. Tilden, though Reid requested it in person, and received a half-humorous denial; though the *Tribune* solemnly inquired:

Dare Samuel J. Tilden make known the key to the secret despatches to and from No. 15 Gramercy Park? If he had no hand in bribery or crime has no friend enough mercy on him to let in the daylight on these ciphers?

Undecoded, the ciphers were embarrassing, played upon by the impish skill of the *Tribune* staff. But Chandler's original little scheme took on a broader scope in Reid's hands. Copies of the dispatches poured in upon the editor. Frank Hiscock, Republican member of the Potter Committee, sent many; Brady mailed others anonymously, and Chandler's initial donation was followed by others. Some five or six hundred dispatches were thus obtained, in addition to those made available to the public through the reluctant exertions of the Potter Committee.

Equipped with this material, Reid's campaign passed beyond the stage of pin pricks and innuendo. Some of the messages were fairly lucid; a series devoted to the mobilization of the "Rifle Clubs" which had coerced the South Carolina vote were set out in sequence, with the cryptic references explained. The Oregon business was thoroughly reviewed and the picture completed by the inclusion of new translations. But the bulk of the telegrams resisted easy decoding, and Reid determined that their "secret should be unlocked."

Suggestions flooded the *Tribune* office, but none proved valuable. Finally Reid turned to Hassard and Colonel Grosvenor and

bade them seek the key. The two went into seclusion, each in his home, and began their task.

Meanwhile, the Democrats showed no awareness of the doom impending. Throughout September the fires of political controversy were stoked in the normal manner by the platitudes of conventions. Congressional elections were drawing nigh, the fateful mid-point of an administration, and the Democracy set up a vigorous cry of "Fraud"!

The *Tribune* encouraged the shouting with malicious suggestiveness. When the New York Democrats made "Fraud" their principal plank, Reid's paper urged them "to concentrate upon it their entire attention throughout the campaign. We earnestly invite them to get light thrown upon it from every quarter. And we think we can procure them a little help ourselves." It was an admirable "build-up." Half-concealed, half-disclosing, the cipher telegrams were insinuated into the public consciousness until the work was completed and the people ready for a bludgeoning exposé.

On October 3, the *Tribune* announced that the decoding was completed and, as an earnest, several dispatches were published with translations. None of them related to financial affairs; a last opportunity was given to the visiting statesmen to free their souls by confession. None responded.

Four days later, the full story of Democratic intrigue was given to the world. Some 400 dispatches were analyzed and interpreted, the keys and methods explained, and the reader permitted to check the results. It was an amazing piece of work that Hassard and Grosvenor had performed, with no aid but the purely corroborative labors of Professor E. S. Holden, a mathematician of the Naval Observatory. The bulk of the telegrams were couched in a double cipher. Proper nouns, chiefly geographical, were arbitrarily assigned to telltale words and phrases—"river" was zero, and the names of rivers—Rhine, Moselle and Thames, stood for 1, 2, 3, etc. Tilden was Russia; Marble, Israel or Moses and Copenhagen meant greenbacks—a much abused word.

In addition to these fixed symbols, which require great skill in deduction to fathom, a transposition cipher was used for the body of the messages. A ten-word message was arranged in one of two patterns, a twenty-word telegram required a different pair of keys,

and so on—five pairs of sequences or ten keys in all. To bring each message to fit in these patterns, “nulls” were used—meaningless nouns such a Captain, Jane or Thomas. These completed the necessary number of words and also gave the ciphers an engaging air of sheer idiocy.

The substance concealed under this elaborate ritual was bad. Marble, together with John F. Coyle and C. W. Woolley, communicated to Colonel Pelton various offers for electoral votes. It has been asserted that this was done merely as a matter of information, but from the sequences of the telegrams, it does not require a suspicious nature to adduce that Pelton’s only hesitation was at the price, and that only delay and bungling intervened between Tilden and the purchased vote of Florida.

On October 16, the story of South Carolina was published, and the same tale of offers, attempts and failure through haggling and delay. In this instance, the *Tribune* was able to forge an independent link in the chain of circumstantial evidence contained in the telegrams by some reportorial sleuthing, checking the motions of some of the actors in the piece, and finding a complete correspondence with the “business” assigned in the lines.

As far as the *Tribune* itself was concerned, the cipher revelations were an unalloyed triumph. Even the *Sun*, chief mourner at Tilden’s political funeral and fervent believer in the resurrection of the just, was impelled to a reluctant tribute to its rival’s enterprise. The job had been prepared skilfully and completed thoroughly; as perfect an example of the art of political exposure as American journalism can reveal, worthy of comparison with the *Times*’s stroke against Tweed.

The political consequences, also, were eminently satisfactory to the paper. Tilden, a broken man, denied all knowledge of the proceedings in his house. John Bigelow asserted that the *Tribune*’s great work was merely “the *tu quoque* defense of the *gamins*,”¹⁷ and even Chandler admitted that he believed “all will turn out to be the artifices of thieving shysters anxious to make money out of Tilden or Marble.”¹⁸ But the country at large was in no mood to make fine distinctions; as the *Sun* sadly remarked, “Mr. Tilden will not again be the Presidential candidate of any party.” It is a well-known principle of law that the plaintiff must appear in court

with clean hands.

With the case against Hayes summarily ejected on the *Tribune's* evidence, the Republicans took on a new confidence. Satisfactory gains were made in the November elections and the process of solidifying the ranks went on apace. Even Hayes seemed frightened by the threat of the Potter Committee into a more amenable frame of mind, for, despite the protests of such "super-serviceables" as George William Curtis, the President supported the candidacy of A. B. Cornell for Governor of New York. Factional strife was stilled for a time, business improved, specie payments were quietly resumed, and the party looked forward to 1880 with hope and assurance.

Whitelaw Reid might well be content with the success that had attended his political ventures with the *Tribune*. The Republican Party had been first notably chastised; then, reformed, at least in part, had resisted attempts to cast it from power—and in all this the *Tribune* had borne a prominent part. The South was pacified if still disgruntled, the dollar was again on a gold basis. The *Tribune* could work in harmony with the party of these achievements; the party was indebted to the paper for light and leadership in a dangerous crisis.

Nor was the Administration ungrateful. In 1878 Bayard Taylor was appointed Minister to Germany, a tribute to the paper he had so long served as well as to his own talents. Taylor survived his appointment less than a year, and the vacant post was offered to Reid. The editor expressed his gratitude but refused:

I have always thought the citizen ought to attempt any task to which his government may summon him. But the work in which I am now engaged, which is also a public duty, seems to give greater opportunities—for me at least—for serving the country and advancing those views of public policy which we agree in thinking essential to its prosperity, than any that could be afforded in the new field you propose.¹⁹

The *Tribune* was identified with, and in high honor in, the Republican Party. The Adullamites were a power in Israel—like all revolutionaries, they were to find an altered perspective in that high position. Meanwhile the nation was undergoing changes more fundamental than the flux of parties and the *Tribune* reflected its own version of those changes.

CHAPTER IX

ECONOMICS AND LABOR

THE administration of Rutherford B. Hayes liquidated the Civil War. The Republicans were still to wave the "bloody shirt," and the South to retort with a solid Democratic vote for many years. The tradition was slow to down. But, as living issues, the war and its problems of government vanished when the Southern representatives abandoned Samuel Tilden. The Conservatives had won at last and the Greeley campaign was vindicated. Freed from the blighting problem of Reconstruction, economic forces assumed the center of the national stage.

In politics, economic conflict developed, on the whole, along familiar lines. The alignment of town against country, of agriculturalist against industrialist, of creditor against debtor, had been a constant factor in American government since colonial days. Only occasionally had foreign affairs, moral questions or theories of the nature of the state tended to obscure this essential tension, as when the issues of slavery and Union produced a cleavage in the ranks of the farmers. Those settled, the old dualism in the country was restored as it had existed in the days of Shays's Rebellion.

The resemblance was the more striking in that the financial and industrial interests were as successful as the men of State Street had been in their conflict with the farmers of the Connecticut Valley. That hegemony of the agriculturalist which the Southern planter had so long maintained was overturned, and the underlying struggle of the politics of the latter half of the nineteenth century was the revolt of the tiller of the soil against the banker and the factory owner whom war and the belated arrival of the Industrial Revolution had placed in power.

The revolt took on many phases; it divided parties and sent out offshoots in the form of new political organization. It permeated the Greenback group, was the essence of the Granger movement,

was powerful in Populism, and a vital force in the Bryanite Democracy. The Easterner was frequently amazed and horrified by some of its manifestations, but there was nothing really novel or revolutionary in the farmers' program. It was less a fight against privilege as such than a campaign against the particular privileges which the East enjoyed; a campaign such as the bankers waged against the loose credit system of Jacksonian Democracy.

For all the high-sounding phrases employed by each side, it was fundamentally an amoral struggle for the balance of power between two economies, and two ways of life. The Tennessee "po' white" and the Texas cattle baron, the Kansas squatter and the wheat magnate of the Northwest made common cause against the financier and the industrialist, whether Pennsylvania iron-master, ruler of hundreds of smoky puddlers, or the laborer whose life's savings were painfully invested in mortgage or annuity. The prize was control of a government which, by land policy, currency manipulation, regulation of communications, or the tariff, could foster one faction above the other.

In this contest, the *Tribune* fought for its side, as will be shown in subsequent chapters. But beneath the warfare of town and country ran another current, possibly more fundamental, certainly more characteristic of the rising industrialization of the country. It sprang from the increasing consciousness of the Have-nots that their lot was less pleasant than that of the Haves. It was the rise of the class warfare of Marxian ideology and it was loosely called the Labor Movement. Most characteristically manifested by the growth of Trades Unions and national workingmen's organizations such as the Knights of Labor, the movement profoundly affected politics. It mingled with the agricultural revolt and developed a radical fringe of Socialist and Anarchist agitation.

The *Tribune* was sensibly affected by the new alignment of social and economic forces after the war. In Greeley's time, as a journal with a spread of circulation over all the north, the paper had appealed to farmer and banker, to employer and laboring man. This was largely due to the unifying force of the slavery issue, which subordinated economic differences in the *Tribune's* field of influence and made it possible for the great editor to unite the classes on a compromise program. Greeley's financial views were

fundamentally those of the banking and manufacturing element—hard money and high tariff. But the farmer was appeased by the *Tribune's* advocacy of internal improvements, railroads and the like, and its liberal land policy, as well as by the interest which the paper took in the technique of agriculture.

The laborer also felt that Greeley was his champion. To the extent that employees identified their interests with those of the employer, this was obviously true, and Greeley went further. As has been said, he fostered the growth of unions, acting as the first President of Typographical Union No. Six, "Big Six." His foray into the Fourierite movement won him the esteem of the worker, and his eccentric but humane personal characteristics gained him a wide reputation for fair dealing among the trades. "The Philosopher," as he was half-affectionately, half-contemptuously known to his contemporaries, was well liked as a man and was generally credited, at least, with good intentions, even by his enemies.

The social philosophy of Greeley was never seriously tested, except as it applied to chattel slavery. Moreover, it became more conservative as the years went on. Fourierism dwindled into co-operation, coöperation, as applied in the *Tribune*, tended to resemble more and more the conventional corporate structure. In labor disputes, the editor's constitutional aversion to coercion and violence came in conflict with his sympathies. But the belief in a strict monetary system and a protective tariff persisted. The labor policy of the *Tribune* in Greeley's last years was liberal in phrase but in essence was that of the Eastern employer. Greeley himself helped bridge the gap between the vague collectivism of pre-war America and the clear-cut individualism of the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The Philosopher's reputation remained, however, to plague his successor. Whitelaw Reid came to a paper which had a tradition of economic liberalism, the specific tenets of which were rapidly being overtaken by events. For his own part, the new editor represented the rising generation as surely as Greeley did that which was fading. Reid believed firmly, in the cant phrase of today, in rugged individualism. His interests and his circumstances drew him ever closer to the side of the *status quo* in economic theory,

and the *Tribune* mirrored his belief. In its final form, Reid rationalized his doctrine in an address before the Carnegie Institute in 1902. After reviewing the expansion of the United States from sea to sea, Reid drew his conclusion:

To such a continental conquest of nature and of men have those two traits of the fathers brought us—their respect for authority and their widest freedom of individual initiative. . . . To harm either is criminal—whether to break down respect for authority by unlawful combinations, tricky evasions, and open defiance of order, or to cramp the widest freedom of the individual in any lawful enterprise or labor anywhere. Whoever or whatever now dares to interfere with the permanent union of these two traits and their continued development in the American life is an enemy to the Republic whether known as Political Boss, or as Trust or as Trades Union.¹

It is easy to cavil at the historical basis of this argument; nevertheless it expressed, certainly until the Fourth of March, 1933, substantially the opinion of the majority of the American people. And undoubtedly Reid voiced the underlying philosophy of the *Tribune* from the death of Greeley down to the present. While the specific references to Trusts and Trades Unions may be archaic, the *Tribune* has tended to resist the integration of our social and industrial system in the interests of freedom of will—for those whose energy and capacity enable them to exercise it.

The contrast between the *Tribune* of 1845, say, and of 1880, in the approach to economic questions, is thus rather striking. Social reformers such as James Baird Weaver, who continued to think of Greeley in terms of his Fourierite phase, found Reid a disappointment. But the new editor of the *Tribune* had not only inherited a more conservative policy than was represented by the *Tribune* of 1845; he was faced by industrial conflict to which the Greeley formulae did not apply.

The panic of 1873 and the ensuing depression were on a scale hitherto unknown in this country. Previously, the edge of hardship had been dulled by the relative ease with which surplus Eastern labor had drained off into the Western farm lands, there to become at least partially self-sustaining. The *Tribune* had always encouraged this process, for Greeley had, in addition to his

sentimental belief in the value of agriculture to its practitioners, a realistic conception of the function of the national land as a safety valve for industrial pressure. But in 1873, the valve was slower to react. Industry had become more specialized, and labor lost, in consequence, some of its mobility. Moreover, the farmer was one of the first to feel the post-war deflation, and the Western lands lacked much of their charm. Labor, bottled up in the temporarily over-crowded East, sought new outlets, and a series of industrial explosions was the result.

It is idle to speculate on Greeley's possible reactions to the labor troubles of the 'seventies. The latter were accompanied by violence and coercion on an alarming scale. Reid refused to condone the violence and grew rapidly out of sympathy with the unions; his individualistic concepts were crystallized and by the summer of 1877 he stigmatized both capital combinations and the trades unions as "public enemies." Hard upon this declaration followed the great Railroad Strike of 1877, which confirmed Reid and many another in that belief.

The strike began with a walkout of employees of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. It spread rapidly through the Northeast, and transportation was seriously interfered with. Rioting broke out with the introduction of strike breakers; Americans heard, with a thrill of horror, mobs shouting for "Bread or Blood" as they surged through Pittsburgh streets. Shops and cars were fired and the militia shot into the crowds. Street fighting was no new feature in the life of the nation. New York, Memphis and New Orleans had been terrorized by mobs within most men's memories—but the strike introduced a Continental quality which was alarming. The press raised an immediate clamor for repression and reprisals.

The Great Strike was not a revolution. No theories of government were agitated; the rioters were actuated by the simple desire to raise their own wages. But the same could have been said of the Paris *ouvrier* who overturned Louis Philippe and died stubbornly behind his barricade in the June Days of 1848. The elements of revolution were present, lacking only the general philosophy which would make it universal. With the vision of the Paris Commune fresh in their minds, conservative Americans

prepared to meet the onslaught.

The *Tribune* was in the forefront of the demand for drastic action. Correspondents on the spot reported that the men who shrieked for bread had been receiving from "\$1 to \$1.50 per day," which seemed fair wage to the employer of the 'seventies. The paper, therefore, while admitting the right to strike, argued that the violent interference with scabs, under the conditions, outlawed the rioters. The railroads were urged to make no concessions and the *Tribune* demanded that the government stamp out the *émeute*:

It is the business of the government to end such disorders, and it will be a mercy to the strikers themselves and to all concerned to end this business quickly, whatever the cost.

The fear which the riots inspired is vividly revealed by the insistence upon harsh measures to punish the ringleaders. The *Tribune* asked, in capitals, "IS IT ALL TO BE CONDONED?"

And what is society to do when, with egregious folly, a muck is run against it, except to shoot, arrest, imprison, sentence and in capital cases, hang?

This type of solvent for labor disputes makes unpleasant reading today. But the panic behind it was genuine and goes far to explain much of the social history of that generation. The Great Strike of 1877 was the first major collision between capital and labor in this country. It awakened the public to the latent possibilities of the class struggle, with a haunting example of terrorism. It aligned the forces. The strikers, said the *Tribune*, have made one true statement. "They assert that the press is in sympathy with Capital. Generally the press does hold that honorable position." To maintain any other, continued the paper, would be "a betrayal of the public interest, a gross injustice to the laboring men, and a betrayal of self-government to its most dangerous foes."

The implications of the strike went beyond the immediate questions of wages and coercion by strikers. The *Tribune* professed to see in that ugly phenomenon the culmination of a period of loose thinking on economics and government. "Public opinion

slaughtered men and burned buildings in Pittsburgh . . ." said an editorial. "For years we have been fostering a spirit of Communism in these United States." Specifically, the paper hit at the demoralizing effect of inflation agitation; more specifically still at the so-called Granger legislation for the control of railroads.

The *Tribune* had not objected to the latter, in principle, at its inception. The wave of indignation at methods of railroad finance which swept through the country prior to the panic of 1873, culminating in the shameful exposures of the Credit Mobilier and the Erie War, had placed the empire builders in a distinctly equivocal position in the public eye. The multifarious exactions practiced on the farmer awakened a storm of protest which found the Eastern press rather sympathetic. In 1871, when the storm was, in the *Tribune's* phrase, "a cloud no bigger than a man's hand," the paper took the roads severely to task for disregarding their obligations; financed by the public funds, they flouted the public interest.

The farmers leagued to battle the railroads. They formed the order of the "Patrons of Husbandry," popularly called the Grange from the title of their local subdivisions. Entering politics vigorously, the Grangers succeeded in capturing several state legislatures and in passing laws which fixed transportation rates within state boundaries. The *Tribune* sympathized with the motives of the Grangers, since "great abuses did exist which the railways had refused to correct," but the paper condemned the specific legislation to which the movement gave birth as "inexpedient and unwise." By rate-fixing, said the *Tribune*, the Granger states had ruined the railroad companies and had failed to secure their own ends, inasmuch as, the authority of the laws not extending beyond individual state lines, the cost of interstate freight had actually increased.

The strike of 1877 seemed, to the *Tribune*, to give melancholy confirmation to this view of the inexpediency of the Granger Laws. The paper's attitude was that these laws had made it impossible for the roads to pay higher wages—an attitude not wholly in consonance with the facts. From this, the *Tribune* concluded that the extension of government control of industry would

be a mistake. The social philosophy of the paper took on a definite form, expressed editorially on July 27, 1877. Inflationists, ran the argument, robbed their creditors; the Grangers robbed the transportation companies; the Trades Unions robbed the laborer who wished to work; the whole process of larceny weakened respect for law and led to the bloody scenes which had just horrified the nation. To combat this disintegrating triumvirate and restore the twin columns of society, the authority of law and "the widest freedom of individual initiative" became the *Tribune's* mission.

The effect of this temper was manifest. Labor militant was closed to the *Tribune* as a source of circulation. As a matter of fact, it was closed to most of the press of New York as it was then constituted, since the *Tribune's* views were those of the majority of its competitors. It remained for Pulitzer and Hearst to dig into the rapidly accumulating labor population with the spade of a liberal program and fetch up the large circulation which the more conservative papers refused to attempt to dislodge. The western circulation of the *Tribune Weekly* was further restricted, and the shift toward a purely metropolitan paper continued. True, the *Weekly* maintained the size of its clientèle, but the territorial spread diminished. The *Tribune* was not yet a typical New York City daily, but it tended to become more nearly a New York State institution. In the stratification of American society, the *Tribune* inevitably lost much of its catholic appeal, became more closely identified with wealth and culture, conservatism and the Republican Party.

The economic struggle of the 'seventies had a reflex in the internal history of the paper, leading to one of the longest and most colorful strikes in newspaper history. Beginning in the *Tribune* composing room it spread into politics and may have influenced national events. As an illustration of the labor background of the nineteenth century and of a major problem in newspaper management, it deserves detailed narration.

1877 was not the first year in which friction between the *Tribune* and the Typographical Union had occurred. For all the veneration in which Greeley's name is held by brethren in the craft, the old gentleman was not one to submit with equanimity

to what he considered exactions on the part of his typesetters. During the war, he acquiesced, although protesting, in the advances in wage scale which the union demanded; but when the compositors refused to set up an advertisement of the *Times* for non-union printers to break a strike, Greeley rebelled, and his typesetters walked out. The *Tribune* was an open shop for several years, but eventually an agreement was reached. Few scars remained: Amos Cummings, for instance, left his case with the rest only to return and gain an editorial post. It was a quarrel of detail, not principle.

As Greeley's grip on the routine of office slackened, the composing room force became vaguely aware that new events were shaping in their domain. The old-time typesetter was a man of dignity and position. Thomas Rooker, with his diamond-studded shirt front and a financial interest in the establishment almost as large as that of the founder, gives the measure of the importance of his craft. Parton, in his description of the *Tribune* of the 'fifties, notes with respect that the compositors were referred to as "gentlemen."² Their pay was the equal of that of the best reporters, and the transition from the composing room to the city desk or editor's chair was not uncommon; indeed it was the rule in the days when the *Tribune* was young.

By 1869, specialization had set in and the *cursum honorum* of journalism had been deflected. The men over the type cases saw young college men progress to positions of importance while their own brethren grew gray at the stick. Amos Cummings gave vent to the emotions of the composing room when he wrote:

As a rule, thoroughly competent printers have better judgment and more newspaper tact than editors manufactured out of collegiate graduates. The majority of the printers of the *Tribune* office are today better posted on general news matters than a majority of the *Tribune* editors. When will newspaper managers begin to use the raw material lying under their very noses? I have known owners of journals to run from one end of the country to the other in a vain search for a competent Managing Editor, when little fellows setting type in their own offices were fully able and competent to get out just such newspapers as were wanted in their various sections.³

This bit would apply equally well to John Russell Young or Whitelaw Reid at the time it was written. The feeling against

this state of affairs was naturally intensified by Reid's rise, soon after, to the chief editorship, and eventually to ownership, after a service on the paper of four years.

Thus Reid began his editorship with the handicap of a type-setting force, in a measure at least, prejudiced against him. This, with Reid's habitual reserve, made his efforts to restore something of the *camaraderie* of the old paper seem patronizing. The gulf between the editorial and composing rooms widened rapidly. The final factor in the breach was Reid's individualistic business philosophy, his detestation of anything representing coercion of the individual by extra-legal groups.

The *Tribune's* great clash with the Typographical Union was precipitated by the hard times of the 'seventies. Two cuts in the wage scale of printers had dropped their returns to 46¢ per 1,000 ems, or, roughly, 20%, by 1877. The *Tribune* managers felt, however, that this general scale involved a peculiar hardship for them, since the paper's "wide measure, fat type, and liberal use of leads and display" permitted larger bills by compositors, word for word, than on the more compact *Herald*, for instance. This relative injustice, along with certain union practices for fattening printing bills, led the management to address the following communication to their composing room force:

What we want and would like our men to consider:—

1. A reduction in the price of composition on night work to 40¢ and on day work to 33¢—or about one-fourth off from the very highest prices of the flush times before the panic.

2. No work to be done which we do not want and cannot use—in other words, no "bogus" and no allowance in place of it.

3. Work to be done at fair prices in whatever way we may think most to our interest—by the piece or on time, at foreman's option.

4. No double price matter.⁴

It is quite evident that these proposals implied a greater reduction than was stipulated in the first article. "Bogus," for instance, was the term applied to work done in the intervals between the completion of one batch of copy and the arrival of the next. It was not used by the paper, and was intended wholly as a basis of recompense for the time spent in waiting.

The special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Union was called to discuss these proposals, and the *Tribune's* typesetters were empowered to refuse them *in toto* and to resign if they were adhered to. Reid remained firm, and on June 29, 1877, 66 compositors and 23 substitutes walked out. The strike thus begun was to last, with but one interruption of less than a month, for over fifteen years; and it became, in duration and in methods employed, one of the most extraordinary struggles in the history of American labor.

Immediately upon the walkout, the *Tribune* ordered that no "member of Typographical Union No. 6, or any printers' trade union, or anyone known to be in sympathy with such organizations be employed in the *Tribune* composing or proof rooms." The signers of the Union's answer to the *Tribune's* proposals were specifically and permanently blacklisted, and a new crew was engaged under the following pledge:

We hereby pledge ourselves to sever our relations (where any now exist) with Typographical Union No. 6, or any printers' Union whatever and to maintain no relations of any sort with any printers' Union. We pledge ourselves to work in the *Tribune* office at *Tribune* prices and under *Tribune* regulations. We pledge ourselves to give no aid in any scheme of any printers' Union to interfere with or gain control of, the *Tribune* office, and we agree to furnish the foreman any information we may have as to persons working in the *Tribune* office in the interest of the Union, or as to any schemes against the office. We further pledge ourselves to engage in no strike, or combination to leave the service of the paper without at least one week's notice, and hereby agree that any violation of this pledge shall forfeit whatever may be due us from the *Tribune* Association. All this we pledge ourselves faithfully to perform so long as we remain in said office, upon our honor as printers and gentlemen.⁵

The union took no steps of any importance to combat these measures of the paper, and the *Tribune* operated as an open shop without serious dissension until 1883. In November of that year, while Mr. Reid was absent from New York, the "scab" compositors struck and went over to the union. The immediate cause is not apparent, but there seems to have been some dissatisfaction with the foreman, one W. P. Thompson. Thompson had joined the *Tribune* after the walkout in 1877, "a poor Virginian and a

rebel soldier," who entertained pronounced anti-union sentiments, and who was later accused by the union of beating his wife. His record in the later squabbles seems rather equivocal.

At all events, confronted by the loss of the majority of his staff, and with the owner six hundred miles away, Thompson entered into negotiations with the union. Reid, according to his foreman, on hearing of the affair, wired Thompson to fight it out, and concede nothing, but an agreement had already been signed on November 19. This document, which was to play a leading part in the coming affray, was somewhat ambiguously worded. The agreement stipulated that the union scale of 46¢ per 1,000 ems be paid, that the *Tribune* was to be a union office, that the foreman was not to be interfered with in any way so long as he fulfilled the first two clauses, and finally that the boys and apprentices, as well as the men working on the typesetting machines, were not to be interfered with by the union. The arrangement was to run for a year, but was terminable at either party's election if thirty days' notice were given. This agreement was signed by John R. O'Donnell, President of the Union, on behalf of the printers and by Thompson "For the *Tribune* Association." ⁶

The first point about this contract is that Thompson later claimed that Reid "never approved it or gave me any authority for it." He did not object to the increased wage scale, but insisted on "running his own office without outside dictation." Thompson assured him "as an old anti-Union man" that this was provided for in the agreement, and the *Tribune's* owner was at last persuaded not to "kick over the whole thing." ⁷ The union was convinced, however, that Thompson was acting with authority, and Reid's tacit acceptance would seem to justify this assumption.

The operation of the *Tribune* shop under this covenant was short-lived but chaotic. In essence, the chief difficulty seems to have been caused by the contradiction between the article guaranteeing a union shop and that securing Thompson from interference. True, this latter clause would seem dependent on the former, but Thompson evidently did not so regard it, and friction inevitably ensued. The foreman's account is at least graphic:

Work was systematically delayed; the Union was perpetually sending in agents to interfere; it detached the regular force, flooded me with strangers as substitutes, and set my own men dogging my steps night and day and those of every other employe they suspected of loyalty to the office which employed them. It sent in men whom I had discharged before the strike for carelessness and gross blunders and forced me to submit to the humiliation of putting them at work again under the threat of another strike in half an hour if I did not.

Contrary to the agreement, attempts were made to unionize the apprentices, but Thompson threatened to revoke the agreement, and the efforts in that direction ceased. Wrangles developed over the extension of the pay scale to various types of work, the printers insisting on certain union formulae, which Thompson, who had previously been supreme in his domain, was disinclined to accept,

. . . such, for instance, as forcing me to pay for a big electrotype cut of ——'s organs, four or five inches square, which they had absolutely nothing to do with, precisely as much as if it had filled that space with solid agate composition. The cost entailed by the whole list of these trade exactions raised the bill of the composing room to three times the increase I had calculated from the advance in the rate and had reported to my employer as the only necessary cost of the change.⁸

The final blow (in a very literal sense) came when an attempt was made to unionize Thompson. The latter temporized for a few days, then decided it did not square with his duty to his employer, and was furthermore a patent breach of the contract. He refused, and the same night narrowly missed being sand-bagged. He now resolved to exercise his "undoubted right of dismissal by discharging the most mischievous of the men in the office." Thompson asserted that he did not dismiss all the union men, but that upon his dismissal of the "most mischievous" the union called a strike.⁹ The union's contention is that it was a lockout of the whole union force, instigated by Reid without exercise of the thirty day clause. Thus there is a direct question of veracity presented, with little evidence on either side. This much can be said, however; Reid was not in sympathy with the agreement from the first, and it is certain that there was no pressure from the manager to secure a working arrangement. On the other side, it can be argued that most employers will recognize the

aggravations of dealing with union labor, particularly after a long lockout. The men were evidently determined to make the most of the agreement, and the master to grant them as little as possible.

At all events, the agreement was terminated violently on December 12, 1883, and policemen guarded the *Tribune* Building. On this occasion, the union was thoroughly aroused by what they considered the bad faith of the *Tribune* management, and they proceeded to take extraordinary measures. The Executive Committee resolved "to take steps toward an immediate and effective boycotting of the *Tribune*." In pursuance of this design, a letter was sent to all the *Tribune* advertisers, which read as follows:

New-York, Dec. 17, 1883

Messrs.—

The Trade unions and labor organizations of New-York and vicinity (numbering 75,000 persons) have resolved not to patronize those advertising in or subscribing for the *New-York Tribune*.

Your advertising appears in the issue of December 16. Should you consent to withdraw it by the 23rd inst., the several organizations will be immediately notified of your action.¹⁰

On the 18th, a Boycotting Committee was formed, and labor organizations were circularized to the effect that the union

. . . has decided to attempt to boycott the most pronounced opponent of the workingmen of America, the *New York Tribune*. As boycotting is the most effective weapon at the disposal of labor organizations, and as this is the first organized attempt to introduce in the East a system which has proved irresistible in the West, we feel confident that we can count on the support of every workingman in our contemplated movement.¹¹

The *Tribune*, in the face of the strike, at first adhered to its old policy of silence concerning its internal affairs. The *Post*, however, printed an account of the origins of the strike on December 13, and called for an explanation. Foreman Thompson presented an elaborate *apologia*, which was printed in the *Post* the following evening. The *Tribune* remained silent until the 23rd, when the distribution of the boycott letter to its advertisers brought forth an editorial characterizing the whole affair as "A

Silly Business" on the part of "about seventy-five very mad and disappointed tricksters." The advertisers' reactions, according to this statement, were not very encouraging to the union, and none succumbed to the implied threat.

The union thereupon resorted to more elaborate methods. On December 29 appeared the first issue of *The Boycotter*, a weekly journal which served the dual function of advertising the boycott and providing the union with an organization publication. The methods of attack employed were direct and primitive. Heads were carried regularly—"Boycott the *Tribune*. It is the enemy of organized labor"—"The only 'scab' morning paper in this city is the *Tribune*." Bits of scandal—the attacks of Dana, the suppressed retraction of the "Crumbs of Comfort" editorial, the Gould connection—were played up. A regular feature was a column on the activities of the *Tribune's* "scab" staff, which was vividly pictured as a most disreputable crew slinking about under the lash of Thompson, "a tyrant who has never been paralleled in any printing office in the country," and in daily fear of the righteous wrath of the union. A program for boycotters was printed:

How To Boycott

- I. Do you take the *Tribune*? If so, stop it.
- II. Do you know of any friend, neighbor or acquaintance who takes it? If so, talk and reason with him to stop it.
- III. Does your grocer take it? If so, tell him he must choose between the loss of your custom and stopping the paper.
- IV. Does your tobacco dealer, barber or druggist subscribe for it? If so, tell him you cannot deal with him unless he will stop it.
- V. Do not buy anything that you require for your daily needs from anyone who either subscribes for or advertises in the *New York Tribune*.

In spite of this vigorous campaign, the paper was not seriously affected. *The Boycotter* reported newsstands barren of *Tribunes* but the very violence of the attack probably solidified Reid's resistance.

The union decided to take up a new line of attack. It entered politics.

In May, 1884, when the *Tribune* was promoting the candidacy of James G. Blaine, the union sent a delegation to the Republican

National Committee, asking that Reid and his paper be disowned as inimical to organized labor. The request was ignored. Thereupon, *The Boycotter* issued a "Chicago Edition" which bluntly stated: "IF MR. REID IS NOT DISOWNED BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WE WILL BOYCOTT IT THROUGH THE COMING ELECTION." But Blaine was nominated, and the party refused to renounce his most effective champion. Thereupon "Big Six" met in conclave and it was resolved

. . . that until the Republican National Committee give us written assurance that they will repudiate the *Tribune* the future policy of *The Boycotter* shall be to Boycott the *Tribune* and James G. Blaine.¹²

Some attempts were made by political leaders to adjust the differences between the paper and the union, but the situation was now too embittered for compromise. *The Boycotter*, therefore, appeared with a new head strewn through its pages: "Boycott the *Tribune* and James G. Blaine"; and workers were exhorted to put the Trade Unions first and party second.

The new development gave quite an opportunity for the Democratic papers, particularly the *World*. The *Tribune*, as the opponent of organized labor, was used to characterize the Republican Party as the party of wealth—and was not Whitelaw Reid among those present at "Belshazzar's Feast"? The *Tribune* retorted with a detailed statement from the compositors showing their politics and their income for an average week—and there were 17 professed Republicans, 16 Democrats and 1 Independent in the composing room. This statement was prepared according to an editorial "without suggestion from us and without our knowledge in response to attacks from other papers."

During the campaign, attempts were made to compound the matter, and the *Tribune* claimed that the charge of bad faith had been retracted. But the negotiations fell through, and, according to Stevens, the historian of the union, "a large majority of the union" (which numbered 3,500 men) voted Democratic.¹³ It is interesting, but unprofitable, to speculate on what proportion of these voters were turned by the *Tribune's* course from the Blaine ranks into Cleveland's camp. As Cleveland's plurality in New York was so slim, it may well be that a decisive 800 votes

or so were swung. At all events the union always claimed, although the claim has been largely ignored,¹⁴ that Typographical Union No. 6 had defeated James G. Blaine for the Presidency.

In the following year, the Republican state committee took a hand and again negotiations began. Articles were drawn up and signed, making the *Tribune* once more a union office, but a rumor spread that the paper was attempting to dissuade men in its employ from joining the union, thus violating one of the points agreed upon. The union claimed that its president had been too trusting in signing the compact, and refused to ratify. The war had left deep scars of mistrust. And in the elections of that year the union took credit for the election of a Democratic governor.

The battle now was deadlocked. As this became evident, some of the sharp edge of *The Boycotter's* attack was dulled, and the paper itself changed its name in November, 1886, to *The Union Printer*. The *Tribune* was not forgotten. Linotypes had been introduced into the composing room of the paper on June 30, 1886, and were immediately the subject of the union's wrath. Of course it was claimed that Reid had taken up Mergenthaler's invention in order to rid himself of the embarrassment of compositors. True, the owner of the *Tribune* had, upon the installation of the machines, offered every opportunity to the printers in the office to familiarize themselves with the new method of typesetting, but *The Union Printer* claimed that Thompson had later drawn a deadline around the linotypes, with Reid's consent, over which the compositors were forbidden to pass.

The stalemate in the strike lasted for five years. During this period futile efforts were occasionally made to bring about a peace, but serious negotiations were not begun until 1891. This last, and eventually successful, venture in pacification extended from November of 1891 until the following June. The union stuck by its guns, announcing in April that it would never recognize the *Tribune* as a union office "until every requirement of the constitution, by-laws, and scale of prices is complied with. Ante-convention and ante-election promises to unionize won't go."

The union now considered itself as an important factor in politics, and, from the interest displayed by Republican politi-

cians, justly so. The taste of blood in the campaign of 1884 had awakened the printers to the power of their union and its publication. Not only did *The Union Printer* advocate and assist the boycotts of other labor organizations, but it brought pressure to bear on legislation. For instance, when Governor Flower, in 1892, vetoed a state printing bill which the union favored, *The Union Printer* warned him: "Well, Gov. Flower, you are thought to be a dark horse in the Presidential candidacy. The union printers of this State defeated a far better man than you are, and really, for less cause."

This political power, although probably not as great as the union was inclined to believe, evidently had its bearing on the final settlement of the fifteen years' war with the *Tribune*. On June 5, 1892, it was reported to the union that a plan of settlement had been arranged with the erring journal, which consisted simply in placing a union foreman in charge of the composing room with full powers. The report also recommended that a committee be sent to the Republican National Convention at Minneapolis to announce the cessation of hostilities. This portion of the report would seem to have been one of the conditions of the settlement, since Reid had just returned from France to take an active part in politics. At all events the report was unanimously accepted by the union, and the Committee was sent. When General Horace Porter rose to second Whitelaw Reid's nomination for the Vice-Presidency, he remarked:

It is said that Mr. Reid has had difficulties with the Typographical Union. That has all been amicably settled. We have that statement from the President of the organization who was here present today and he has placed it in writing.

Reid was nominated unanimously, and, on August 11, the officers of the union announced the boycott off. Labor organizations were again circularized to the effect

. . . that the differences between our union and the *New York Tribune* have been satisfactorily adjusted; that the boycott against that establishment and its manager have been declared off, and that all antagonisms of whatever nature, growing out of the famous labor struggle, are ended. It gives us great pleasure to announce, furthermore, that the *Tribune* is now a strict union office.¹⁵

CHAPTER X

STALWART AND HALF-BREED

THE decade from 1880 to 1890 forms a curious interlude in American political life. Though few great issues came to the fore, bitter feuds rent the parties, and public discussion was violent in the extreme. Essentially, it was a strife of factions, a battle for spoils. The emotions of the struggle over Union and Slavery were applied to the question of the distribution of offices.

Inevitably, the *Tribune* was drawn into the unsavory struggle. But, though the internal warfare of the Republican Party in these years afforded little scope for real public service, the *Tribune* took, on the whole, the better side in that warfare.

The feud between Stalwart and Half-Breed had its roots far back in the history of the Republican Party. It was the result, principally, of the rivalry of certain chiefs of the organization. Morally, there was probably little to choose between the two factions, but the Half-Breed leaders were willing and able to make greater concessions to the reform element in the party, and could therefore usually count on the support of that element in the struggle against the opposing group. But the existence of the schism was a constant threat to Republican solidarity.

The conflict had flared up in ugly fashion during the Administration of Rutherford B. Hayes, only to subside perforce under the threat of the assault on Hayes's title, and the growing discontent of the West. For a time, both factions were conciliatory, united against common foes. But the Democratic threat was eliminated, largely by the *Tribune's* exposure of the cipher dispatches, and the Western danger was allayed by the swift-returning tide of prosperity.

As confidence returned, Grant returned with it. The ex-President completed a world tour in 1880, fêted abroad and warmly welcomed home. He was again the hero of Vicksburg and Appomattox, and at the sign of his reviving prestige, ambitions,

stified by the chastening influence of the reformers in 1876, revived with it. Above all, the egregious Roscoe Conkling saw in Grant's renewed popularity an opportunity to regain his former eminence. The hopes of the "old gang" centered about Grant.

But the fears of other leaders took fire at this sudden recrudescence. Newspapers again sounded the alarm of "Caesarism," and of course the *Tribune's* hand was first on the bell rope. The threatening spectacle of the Grant boom united the other candidates against him.

Some of the bloom was off the *Tribune's* idealism by 1880. Ever more practical than the majority of his fellow rebels, White-law Reid had perceived in the errors of the Hayes Administration the need for "men who add to the innocence of the dove a little of the wisdom of the serpent,"¹ and his admiration for the astute James G. Blaine had correspondingly increased. "Sound" on currency and tariff, Blaine had differed with the *Tribune's* editor only over the war issues. With these practically defunct, Reid and the *Tribune* entered wholeheartedly into the work of making the Senator from Maine President.

The third outstanding candidate in the preconvention campaign was John Sherman, a good politician with more than average abilities in statesmanship, but cursed by a colorless personality. On May 7, 1880, the *Tribune* declared that the chief task of the Republican convention would be to decide between Blaine and Sherman, with Reid's old friend, James Abram Garfield, a Sherman man, Benjamin Harrison and William Windom of Minnesota as potential dark horses. Reid, however, knew that Grant would come to the convention as the strongest single candidate, and the one object of the *Tribune* was to defeat him.

The battle opened in the state conventions which met to choose delegates to the national gathering. The first onslaught of the Grant men was brutally effective. Pennsylvania, under Don Cameron's leadership, instructed for the General; General John A. Logan secured a similar result in Illinois and Conkling forced through the same measure in New York, exacting a personal pledge of all the delegates to support his candidate. But Conkling's victory proved only temporary. The New York press began to berate the unlucky delegates with all the hard words at

their disposal; the *Tribune* warned: "If you aid in the nomination of President Grant, you imperil the success and even the life of the Republican Party." Heart-searching followed, and though the majority clung to their word, some sixteen recanted and took their belated consciences to the convention. The Regulars called them "Half-Breeds," asserting their own "Stalwart" Republicanism, and the factions were named.

At the National Convention, the struggle passed into an even more intense phase. Conkling strove for the adoption of the unit rule, which would cancel out his disaffected minority, but the other candidates united their strength against him. Under the skilful guidance of Garfield, the attack on the unit rule was successful, adding much to the Ohio man's prestige, for by this decision, said the *Tribune*, the Republican Party became "the party of the people—the expression of their will, the agent of their power, the fortress of their liberties."

But the Grant forces still refused to admit defeat. Stubbornly they held their ranks through 36 ballots, when, since neither Blaine nor Sherman could unite all of the anti-Grant elements, Garfield was selected as a compromise candidate over the prostrate forms of the Stalwart "Old Guard." Even then it was deemed wise to attempt to placate the furious Conkling by nominating his charming satellite, Chester A. Arthur, for the Vice-Presidency.

With Grant defeated, the *Tribune* was well content, even though Blaine was sacrificed. "With its best judgment the *Tribune* approves, with its heartiest enthusiasm the *Tribune* applauds the work of the Chicago Convention." Indeed, Garfield, an unassuming, capable gentleman of great personal attractions, and, moreover, close to Reid politically and individually, was an ideal substitute for the paper's chosen candidate. His success meant the domination of the faction with which the *Tribune* was aligned, and a peculiarly responsible position for Reid and his paper in party councils.

But if the *Tribune* was satisfied, others were distinctly less pleased at the Republican selection. Conkling was unappeased by the sop of the Vice-Presidency, and strenuous diplomacy was necessary to swing him into line. Whether this culminated in the so-called "Treaty of Mentor," which Conkling asserted as the basis

for his claims to patronage, is a debatable point. Arthur solemnly assured Thomas Nast that he had been a personal surety for the alleged treaty;² Garfield and Reid always denied it.³ At any rate, Conkling's coöperation was secured at the cost of a serious potential misunderstanding.

Apart from internal strife, the Republican task was not very difficult. There were no weighty or dangerous issues to debate, and the party's platform was so pointedly platitudinous that the *Tribune* felt obliged to comment:

Happy is the party which has so little to explain in its past, and so little need to promise new things for the future. Its acts have spoken for it.

Nor did the Democratic Convention add greatly to the burdens of Republican managers. A "good man, weighing 250 pounds," General Winfield Scott Hancock, was chosen to lead the opposition; and, with some logic but less tact, the candidate proceeded to smash the one Democratic plank that showed any signs of supporting his weight. The party had come out for a "tariff for revenue only"—merely to have its nominee brush the matter aside as "a local issue." The tariff became a minor disharmony in the symphony of the contest.

On the Republican side, the campaign was distinguished by a renewal of the onslaught on the Solid South. The "bloody shirt," tattered and unvenerable emblem of old hatreds, was broken forth as the banner of the party which had just removed the last political disabilities of the states south of the Mason and Dixon line. That the *Tribune* joined in waving this banner is regrettable but understandable; the "bloody shirt" was the outcome of the disappointment felt by many Liberals at the Southern reception of Hayes's policy of lenity. Hopes, such as those held forth by the *Tribune*, of a birth of a true Republicanism in the late confederacy had proved illusory, and a reaction to old sectionalism followed in the North. Blaine, never a convert of the Liberals in this matter, expressed this feeling in his *Twenty Years in Congress*, published a few years later:

The salient and most considerable effect of the Presidential election (of 1880) was the absolute consolidation of the Electoral vote of the

South; not merely of the eleven states that composed the Confederacy, but of the five others in which slaves were held at the beginning of the civil struggle. . . . The result betokened thenceforth a struggle within the Union far more radical than that which had been carried on from the formation of the Constitution until the secession of the South. . . . It comprehends nothing less than the absolute consolidation of sixteen states—not by liberty of speech or public discussion, or freedom of suffrage, but by a tyranny of opinion which threatens timid dissentients with social ostracism and suppresses the bolder form of opposition by force.⁴

The *Tribune*, in the spirit of this view of the “blind, brutal and causeless solidity” of the South, declared that it also threatened a specific danger to the national treasury, the revival of Confederate war claims and the danger that former slaveholders would demand payment for their sequestered human property. In evidence thereof the paper submitted transcripts of records of freed slaves, preserved in Southern courthouses. The *Tribune* estimated that the cost of indemnifying the slaveholders would amount to some two billion dollars.

An expenditure greater than the entire National debt of the United States would be required to satisfy claims which a Democratic President, Supreme Court and Congress would undoubtedly allow.

The *Tribune's* campaign, under the stress of such emotions as the aforementioned prospect awakened, grew somewhat violent. “Let it be known,” shouted a leader, “that the Democratic Party is the party of slavery, of rebellion, of treason and base surrender to treason.” Or, more simply, “a vote for Hancock means the Gray above the Blue and that involves everything.” The skeptical viewpoint of 1876 and before had been almost wholly lost—the *Tribune* was a Republican newspaper.

The Republican campaign was somewhat embarrassed by the revival of an old scandal. The Democrats centered their campaign about Garfield's record, particularly the Credit Mobilier business. In 1873, the *Tribune* had stated the position of its present standard bearer thus briefly and bluntly:

James A. Garfield of Ohio had ten shares, never paid a dollar; received \$329, which, after the investigation began, he was anxious to have considered a loan from Mr. Oakes Ames to himself.

This was ammunition for the Democrats, and effective. Thomas Nast, though he supported the Republican Party, refused to introduce its candidate into his cartoons.⁵ The *Sun* had characterized Garfield in 1878 as a "man of infamous name," and was only partly appeased by the thought that he was, at all events, better than Grant. The vivacious Henry Watterson declared that Garfield's election would be a "triumph for fraud, for bribery, for corruption of all kinds."

The *Tribune's* defense, though logically rather weak, expressed the true status of the case—which was, that it was *res adjudicata*, or at least outlawed by the Statute of Limitations. Garfield's record had been before his Congressional District; he had been reëlected. A Democratic leader, Allan G. Thurman, "the noblest Roman of them all," had declared him innocent, and a unanimous Republican vote in the Ohio legislature had sent him to the Senate. A discreet and modest way of life had redeemed Garfield's error in the popular mind, and the Democratic vituperation reminded the *Tribune* only of an anecdote of Greeley. It seems that the old gentleman was one day regaled by a "flux of profane pyrotechnics" from an angry visitor, ranging from "a simple 'dammit' up to polysyllabic blasphemy." This went on for a quarter of an hour, when, having noticed no reaction in his placidly scribbling host, the unwelcome guest turned to go, exhausted. Whereupon Greeley, "turning his benignant countenance upon the wrathful visitor, said with his peculiar tone: 'Oh, don't go; sit down, and stay a little while and free your mind.'"

Indeed, that was all the Democrats were able to achieve; they freed their minds. Against the storm of words operated powerful and realistic forces which the *Tribune* frankly explained. Fifty thousand Northerners, said the paper, had gone to the South after the war. Now, "decimated by Southern shot-guns, but disciplined" they had returned to work against the party which wielded those weapons. Two thousand National Banks, members of "the best banking system ever devised" were organized against any Democratic threat to their institution. And finally, in defense of the tariff, "thousands of manufacturing establishments are banded together for mutual defense in a dozen associations." Of such was the Republican organization, and it carried Garfield to

victory.

This was of importance to the *Tribune* for several reasons. The paper was now in complete sympathy with a national administration, and, from the intimate alliance existing between its editor and the new President, in a fair way to become a sort of *Moniteur* for the existing government. It had acquired that particular stamp of authority which was to make its utterances regarded as expressive of the current thought at the White House.

This relationship had its drawbacks, however. The new Administration represented a faction, and, in the warfare which soon developed in the party, the *Tribune* was forced into the petty squabbles of Half-Breed and Stalwart with a vengeance. The paper merely fought for its side, and that, as has been said, the better side—but for many a year the weary round of the strife of cliques was all too faithfully mirrored in its pages. As in Greeley's day, the *Tribune* was again straitened in its influence by an editor's personal political affiliations.

Nevertheless, as the principal organ of the chiefs of its party, the *Tribune's* prestige was considerably increased; and it was only with the loosening of party ties and the rise of a new type of journalism that its hold upon readers began to weaken. For two decades the *Tribune* was to be a strong political force, after the fashion of the older school, fortified by its intimate relationship with the sources of political news and power.

The implications of the *Tribune's* position in politics became plain almost immediately after election, when Conkling's half-smothered rage broke out anew. Reid was active in Cabinet making, using his influence and that of the *Tribune* in an attempt to soothe the Stalwarts without making concessions which would give them any real power. It was John Hay's opinion that Conkling was not dangerous if ignored,⁶ and, with the Republican position apparently secure enough to disregard the disaffected, Reid bent his efforts to stiffen the Presidential "no." In this course he encountered a figure who was to affect his own career and that of the *Tribune* to no inconsiderable degree. This was Thomas Collier Platt, of Tioga County in the State of New York.

The New York Legislature met in January of 1881 to select

a Senator to serve with Conkling. Naturally, the senior Senator wished his State delegation to present a united Stalwart front, and equally natural was it for the Half-Breeds of New York to attempt to divide his strength. The former backed Richard Crowley; the latter, Chauncey M. Depew. A deadlock ensued. Blaine, the prospective Secretary of State, had the *Tribune* print a strong, semi-official pronouncement, "By Authority," to the effect that the Administration would not interfere—which was taken as a blow to Conkling's pretensions to Presidential support.

Faced by an *impasse*, the legislature sought to compromise, and the Half-Breeds hit upon Platt of Tioga as an organization man who might be amenable to reason. It was a pregnant choice. Platt had entered national politics in 1872 as the regular Republican nominee from his district for Congress—what time the *Tribune* accused him of buying votes at ten to fifteen dollars each. The charge was unproven, but it was an appropriate debut, in view of his later relations with the paper.

By 1881, many occurrences of 1872 had been forgotten. Platt, soft-spoken drug store proprietor, had become more than a local power; he was now Conkling's chief lieutenant, so strong as to menace his chief and to be considered a possible rival. On the principle of divide and reign, the Half-Breeds resolved to assist the suspected designs of Conkling's subordinate, and entered into negotiations. Half-Breed papers spoke respectfully of Platt; the *Tribune* news columns spoke of the preference of anti-machine men for him as against any other organization man, and lauded his "quiet, self-respecting campaign." Platt was receptive. He pledged himself to aid in securing a fair share of patronage for the original Half-Breeds, the sixteen delegates who had bolted Grant, and even to assist the confirmation of their leader, Judge W. H. Robertson, should he be named to office—this in the face of Conkling's known hatred for Robertson.⁷ Thereupon Depew transferred his votes to Platt and Platt became Senator, despite the "unreasonable prejudice" which already existed against that astute gentleman. The *Tribune* expressed the opinion that the prejudice would vanish, that Platt would be "far more popular two years hence than today."

Mr. Platt does not owe his nomination to Mr. Conkling. . . . He owes it more to the confidence in his fairness and candor felt among a large portion of the anti-machine men.

All this was to seem curiously ironical in but a short time. For Garfield named Robertson as his choice for Collector of the Port (the old bone of contention!) and Conkling stoutly resisted in the Senate. That body, acting on the rule of "Senatorial Courtesy" which makes the opinion of a single Senator binding on all his colleagues in questions of appointments in his own state, refused to confirm. Reid wired Hay to bid the President stand firm, to assure him that "this is the turning point of his whole Administration—the crisis of his Fate. If he surrenders now, Conkling is President for the rest of the term and Garfield becomes a laughing stock." ⁸

The President held his ground; faced by the wall of Senatorial opposition, he withdrew all of the New York nominations except that of Robertson. Some years later the *Herald* resurrected this telegram from Reid—it had apparently been purloined from the telegraph office counterfoils—and used it as evidence that the President had been a "puppet" in the hands of the *Tribune's* editor. Undoubtedly Reid's influence with Garfield was great, even aside from the power he wielded through his journal; but from certain letters it would appear that the President, once the issue was joined, felt less interest in the partizan and personal elements thereof than in his own conception of the dignity of his office. As he wrote to Reid, he would not be the "registering clerk" of the Senate. ⁹

Affairs had reached this interesting point when an important event occurred which temporarily removed Whitelaw Reid from the editorship of his paper. This was his marriage with Miss Elisabeth Mills, daughter of Darius Ogden Mills, financier. The implications of the marriage to the editor from a personal standpoint have no place in this recital; his biographer has dealt with that phase. But the *Tribune* had gained a loyal and devoted ally; and one with the power of a great fortune to back her interest. United with Reid's own wealth, which, through his early connection with the development of the linotype, was to grow to no inconsiderable figure, the capital behind the *Tribune* made that

paper independent, to a great extent, of the changing styles of journalism, as reflected in circulation figures and advertising. But this was a factor which only became important at a later date; meanwhile Reid and his bride departed for an extended honeymoon, and John Hay remained to edit the paper.

Hay was undoubtedly an ideal *locum tenens*. In public policy, he was one with Reid; he had broadened his political acquaintanceship by active work in Ohio elections and had also acquired, since his marriage, valuable business experience. Then, too, Hay had kept in constant touch with the *Tribune*, contributing articles, following the changing personnel and exchanging ideas with its owner. Finally, Hay had a positive genius in the art of maintaining personal relationships, and in winning the confidence and respect of his staff. He consulted with them, without losing prestige thereby, and he was able to render a decision on a knotty point of policy without offense. As one of his associates phrased it, Hay's turn of editorship was a "period of constant delight."¹⁰

To the temporary editor, this delight was not without alloy. He was faced by a political scene which shifted dizzily, and, while acutely conscious that every word in the *Tribune* might bring future trouble for its real proprietor, he felt it incumbent upon him to maintain the vigorous leadership which the paper always asserted. In this he succeeded, partly because of his native ability, partly because of his intimate knowledge of the workings of Reid's mind, and partly because he had under him an experienced staff, long trained in the ways of the *Tribune* and its editor. No break in policy ensued; the paper reacted to new situations in a manner entirely consonant with its past. Joseph Bucklin Bishop, who was on the staff at this time, and was a great admirer of Hay, takes exception to the expression of Hay's earlier biographer, Professor Thayer, that Hay was not sure of Reid's will, and therefore struck out on a line of his own:

There was nothing on earth that Hay was more "sure" of than Reid's wishes in a crisis and he followed the fixed policy of the paper without variation or shadow of change.¹¹

This agrees with William Walter Phelps's pithy remark that Hay had been wound up for the period of Reid's absence and

had kept perfect time.¹²

Naturally enough, those dissatisfied with the *Tribune's* course laid the blame on the temporary editor and, as Hay said, called loudly to Reid "to hurry home and save your property."¹³ Though such Jeremiads in the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Commercial Advertiser* (not to mention the renewed malignancy of Dana's *Sun*) caused Hay to look somewhat wistfully toward the day when his old chief would return "to take your own beatings regular," he could console himself with the thought that Reid, on his return, would be able to find himself unhampered in giving the paper any direction he chose. As he said, "I have as far as possible steered clear of rows without making the paper seem feeble."¹⁴

This was no ordinary feat, for during Hay's short session in the editorial chair the Stalwart-Half-Breed feud passed from high drama to farce comedy and then, startlingly, to black tragedy. The complaisant Mr. Platt found himself in an uneasy position during the fight over Robertson's confirmation. He tried to reconcile the irresistible Conkling and the immovable Garfield with little success. Then, either on Platt's suggestion or that of his senior, Platt and Conkling resigned their seats in the Senate. Their motive was to secure reëlection at the hands of the State legislature, thereby investing Conkling with the prestige of a renewed mandate and divesting Platt of embarrassing pledges.

But the New York legislature proved unexpectedly recalcitrant, though Vice President Arthur made a personal lobbying visit on behalf of his clansmen. Platt was caught in a compromising situation in a hotel room—pure farce—and eventually the posturing pair were laughed into momentary oblivion. In the *Tribune's* figure, just as Athenians tired of hearing Aristides called "the Just," so the American people were bored by "Conkling and Platt."

In the summer of 1881, the *Tribune* might well be pleased with affairs; the Half-Breeds were triumphant, the political head of the opposition had been neatly lopped off. Then, on July 2, a disappointed crack-brain, C. J. Guiteau, fatally wounded the President. Garfield lingered through the hot summer at Elberon, New Jersey, but died on September 19. The assassin had said,

"I am a Stalwart and now Arthur is President!" The climax of the struggle of office-seeking factions had been reached.

The Half-Breeds were wild with rage and grief. A sea of white faces stared silently at the *Tribune's* bulletin boards under the gas lights of Park Row, while an excited crowd of angry partizans surrounded Hay's desk on the fifth floor, demanding that the blame be laid on Stalwart shoulders. One even proposed that the *Tribune's* headline read "Roscoe Conkling, Assassin!"¹⁵ But Hay kept his head, and there was only a passing reference to the dangers of "faction's frenzy" next morning, while a sub-head gave a correct version of the matter—it was indeed a "Crazy Office Seeker's Crime."

Unfortunately, this sudden injection of assassination into the feud did not bring the wranglers to their senses. The *Tribune* was considerate of the new President, placed by violence in such an awkward position of power. While warning Arthur that his only hope of uniting the party lay in becoming "President of the Nation and not the chief of a faction," the paper urged that "there be no stones of unjust criticism cast at him."

Nevertheless, when Reid returned to his office, there was a new storm brewing, and one which was to give a Democratic President to the country. Governor Alonzo B. Cornell of New York had completed a successful administration in the fall of 1882, and felt entitled to another term. But the Governor had remained passive while Conkling and Platt were seeking reëlection; the Stalwart clan was enraged, and in brutal fashion it ended Cornell's hopes in the State convention. Charles J. Folger, Arthur's Secretary of the Treasury, received the nomination; the President's hand was obvious in the revenge on Cornell, and the *Tribune* was thoroughly disgusted:

We shall quarrel with no Republican who sees his duty to lie in a refusal to vote for a man forced upon the party by fraud and violence.

The Half-Breed bolt was tempered by the exigencies of national politics, however, and the *Tribune* very tepidly urged that Folger be elected, and that no efforts be spared to save the legislature. The remainder of the ticket, especially the candidates for Lieutenant Governor and Congressman-at-large, B. Platt Car-

penter and Howard Carroll, the *Tribune* consigned to perdition absolutely. The party needed a good lesson.

The New York Democrats had their opportunity. They nominated Grover Cleveland for Governor, relatively inconspicuous but with a certain prestige as "Veto Mayor" of Buffalo, a city which possessed the advantage of being the whole state away from malodorous Tammany Hall. The *Tribune* did not campaign for Cleveland. It commented that the "nomination of Mayor Cleveland of Buffalo by the Democratic Convention means hard work for the Republicans." But when Cleveland, in a prophetic speech, referred to the current campaign as the "skirmish line" of the Presidential battle of 1884, the *Tribune* took alarm. Willing to chastise its own party locally, the paper shied at fostering Democratic possibilities on the national front.

The election swept the whole Democratic state ticket into office, proving, said the *Tribune*, that the people

. . . serve notice on Mr. Arthur that they will not tolerate his attempt to build up a faction at the expense of his party—will not tolerate the interference of his representatives in forcing unpopular nominations—and that they wish him henceforth diligently to mind his own business.

The "good lesson" was taken to heart, and the Stalwart-Half-Breed schism was practically obliterated as a major element in the Republican organization. New feuds succeeded, new bosses took the place of Conkling, but the *Tribune's* long warfare with that worthy had ended in his complete defeat. Private law practice now absorbed Conkling's showy talents, and a few sneering epigrams were all that the foremost political manager of his day henceforth contributed to his old profession. In a few years, the great blizzard of '88 dramatically removed Roscoe Conkling from all mortal labors.

The last years of Arthur's Administration were more successful than the outset had promised. Amid the clamor of contending politicians, the business of the country prospered hugely. A surplus mounted in the Treasury, and the nation began to discuss, in all seriousness, a government growing too wealthy for its own good. Plans for judicious phlebotomy were eagerly canvassed, and even Republicans began to turn a skeptical eye upon

the tariff, practically untouched since the war. The President set up a commission to look into the question, and when this body returned a report favoring a reduction of import duties ranging from 20% to 25%, even the *Tribune* approved.

This was a substantial, though temporary, alteration in the paper's historic policy. True, a reduction of internal revenue taxes on tobacco and spirits was preferred by the *Tribune*, but, said an editorial:

The present tariff created in time of war was needed to build and develop industries; the Commission recognizes the fact that a different range of duties is needful in time of peace, when industries have been grandly built and developed.

In accordance with Reid's policy of intelligent reporting, he engaged Robert B. Porter, a member of the Commission, to investigate and discuss in the *Tribune* the state of commerce and industry in England, under free trade. The general effect of Porter's articles was not favorable to any extended reduction, and the jobbery of the bill which followed the Commission's report seems to have put the *Tribune* out of sympathy with this method of cutting into the surplus. The tariff was a "suspended issue" for nearly four years, while the Treasury became ever more gorged with increment.

Other acts of the Arthur Administration gave evidence that new things were abroad in the land. A revised Civil Service Act showed that the country was getting behind the reformers; that a party revolt in the interests of this type of civic morality was no longer necessary on a national scale, nor would a revolt against the reformers be tolerated. The open and cynical opposition of old-line politicians was to be replaced by, at least, lip-service to the ideals of the Cincinnati Convention.

Coincident with this advance, another spirit began to stir in the United States. Hesitantly the country began again to look beyond its borders, to recognize its position in the family of nations and to have regard therefor. The renewal of an imperialistic policy in England gained a certain sympathy here; Americans, so shortly released from civil dissension, felt that the arts of peace were somehow inglorious. The *Tribune's* comment on the

English occupation of Egypt in 1882 indicates the changing temper of the country:

Convinced that the action of the government is both necessary and justifiable, the people have a sense of exhilaration and patriotic pride in breaking away from the precedent of neutrality and inaction favored by the Manchester school, and in resuming their old place in Europe.

Significantly enough, this spirit expressed itself here in an increase of naval armaments. Under Arthur, the White Squadron, first ships of the new steel navy, had their origin. However, since American naval experts tended to disregard European experience, the designs for the new craft were regarded with contempt by foreign observers and with mistrust by the *Tribune*.

Such was the situation in 1884. Wealthy and feeling new power stirring within, despite a temporary recession in business, the country turned to its quadrennial amusement, the election of a President. Although lacking graver issues, the election of 1884 was to prove the most spectacular since Greeley had edited the *Log Cabin*, and the Whigs drank Harrison into the White House, forty years before.

James G. Blaine was again a candidate for the Republican nomination, with the *Tribune's* active support. With Conkling out of politics, Blaine loomed prominently, and, as in 1876, he drew the fire of his opponents. Edwin Lawrence Godkin, that able if acidulous warrior for public morality, was editor of the *Evening Post*, and in this paper the forces against Blaine found their most efficient spokesman. The story of the Mulligan Letters was again brought forward, and the *Tribune* moved to the defense of its protégé. William Walter Phelps published a long argument in rebuttal of Godkin's attack.

Phelps, as a close business and personal associate of the accused, claimed to speak with especial authority. He denied that Blaine's friends were interested in the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad at the time of the Speaker's interference in its behalf, and claimed that Blaine's later reference to that episode was in the nature of an "interesting anecdote." The charge that Blaine had concealed, in his reading of the letters, any material evidence, was also denied, as were the rumors of Blaine's great

wealth. The Maine man, said Phelps, had entered into business relations with the road on the same terms as any other.

As in the previous discussions of James G. Blaine, the verdict was bound to turn on the spirit in which the letters were interpreted. And unfortunately for him, a substantial group of his fellow Republicans were disposed to be critical. Blaine stood for traditions in politics which were being outmoded. He was an organization man in much the same sense as his fallen opponent, Conkling. Premonitions of revolt were appearing. For instance, on May 29, the *Times* responded to a letter asking whether that paper proposed to support the nominee of the Chicago Republican Convention:

If that nominee . . . is a man worthy to be President of the United States, the *New York Times* will give him a hearty and vigorous support. If he should be a man who, personally and politically, in office or out, represents principles and practices which the *Times* abhors and has counseled its party to shun, we shall watch with great interest the efforts of those responsible for such a nomination to elect their candidate, but we can give them no help.

Thomas Nast, in *Harper's Weekly*, represented the Republican elephant as the winning animal—unless too heavily burdened. It was plain that a certain element of the old line Republicans were not in sympathy with Blaine.

The *Tribune's* first efforts were devoted to securing Blaine's candidacy in the face of this threatened bolt. His opponents were not strong, politically. Blaine's "magnetism," his engaging personality and splendid platform presence appealed to many, while his skeptical attitude toward Civil Service Reform won the support of the politicians. Robert Lincoln, though "a name to win with," as the *Times* put it, was little but a name, and Senator George F. Edmunds of Vermont, the choice of the majority of the reform group, was Blaine's most serious opponent.

The *Tribune* retorted the Mulligan charge upon Edmunds, claiming that the Senator had voted for a grant to the Burlington and Missouri Railroad at a time when he actually held the bonds of that company. The real issue, said the paper, is the tariff, and the Republicans were exhorted to nominate a man who embodied the protective principle.

To find a candidate of whom no evil can be said, the party will have to rob either the cradle or the grave.

The supporters of Edmunds (including a young New York Assemblyman at his first national convention—Theodore Roosevelt) were speedily worsted in the convention. The *Tribune* shouted jubilantly: "For more than a quarter of a century no other candidate has been more clearly preferred by the voters. The ticket cannot be beaten." But the ground swell of disapproval which had preceded the convention now crashed into a storm of mutiny. The *Times* rephrased the *Tribune's* statement, charging that Blaine "represents the average of Republican honor and conscience as they now are," and flatly refused to support the party. Nast drew his Republican elephant crushed under the weight of the magnetic Blaine, and *Harper's* was lost to the Republicans after long years of fidelity. The *Evening Post*, the *Herald*, the *Springfield Republican*, the *Boston Transcript* and the *Boston Herald* similarly deserted an allegiance of long standing. The defection rapidly assumed dangerous proportions.

Meanwhile Grover Cleveland had won general commendation by his course as Governor, evoking it even from the wary *Tribune*, on occasion. As a result, that paper was able to note, in May of 1884, that "there are whispers in the air that the glittering bait of a Presidential nomination has been dangled before Mr. Cleveland's eyes." The whispers were confirmed by the action of the Democratic National Convention, and Cleveland became Blaine's competitor, to the joy of the dissenting Republicans.

The stolid Cleveland, exuding an air of uncompromising strength and rectitude, was the perfect foil for his brilliant but occasionally injudicious opponent, and inevitably the campaign revolved about these diverse personalities. The *Tribune*, in obedience to Blaine's injunction to Reid to "agonize more and more on the tariff," desperately strove to change the drift of the argument to a discussion of that issue, but practically without success. It charged repeatedly that the bolters opposed Blaine because of his protectionist views, but, while there was some truth in this statement (many of the Liberals of 1872—Godkin and Schurz, for instance—were among the bolters, and Tariff Reform was always a characteristic of that group), the Democratic Plat-

form was too much of a straddle to make the issue a live one.

It was an intensely emotional campaign. The dissenters were labeled "Mugwumps," an Indian word which "Ike" Bromley is credited with having first applied to modern politics during the 'fifties.¹⁶ Literally meaning "Chief," Mugwump was used to characterize those who considered themselves better than the party which claimed their allegiance, the "unco' guid." It was a curious epithet to appear in the *Tribune*, which no longer ago than 1882 had exercised the "sacred right of bolting and scratching."

Yet this derisive appellation was one of the milder manifestations of the campaign. Cartoons were used with savage effect. Bernard Gillam of *Puck* evolved the symbol of the Tattooed Man—Blaine stamped with his record—while Thomas Nast pictured the Republican candidate in frenzied efforts to appear before the public in the clean, white shirt of Reform. Reid was not neglected by the artists. His tall, vaguely Byronic figure was constantly in the picture, vainly endeavoring to scrub off the tattooed record or to adjust the unfamiliar shirt. The *Tribune* and Blaine were almost completely identified in the public mind.

The paper did its best for the candidate. The *Post's* use of parallel columns, setting out contradictions in the Blaine record, was employed by the *Tribune* to stress fallacies in the opposition charges. A new batch of the Mulligan Letters appeared, giving the Mugwumps some comfort, since they contained a letter from Warren Fisher charging Blaine with greed and impatience, as well as a letter from Blaine to Warren Fisher, at the time of the first investigation, begging a certificate of good character. The *Tribune* thereupon published the whole series in sequence, and explained the innocent interpretation which might be placed thereon.

In attack the *Tribune* was as vigorous as when on the defensive. An illegitimate child was discovered in Cleveland's past, and was instantly seized upon by Republicans to impeach the moral character of the Democratic candidate. Said the *Tribune*: "From a thousand pulpits in the land comes the cry 'Unclean! Unclean!'"

The campaign swept on to its dramatic close in a welter of resounding oratory, while enthusiastic partizans paraded in their thousands. The stars in their courses fought against the Republican candidate. The responsibility for the Mugwump revolt may

be laid upon his own shoulders, but the celebrated Prosperity Dinner—"Belshazzar's Feast"—the unfortunate penchant of the Reverend Dr. Burchard for alliteration in his "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion" speech, the emergence of a separate Prohibition Party, smoldering embers of the Stalwart-Half-Breed feud, and, crowning irony, the boycott of the Typographical Union, these were the results of chance or of tactical errors which nevertheless played a decisive part in the Democratic victory.

Yet Blaine came within a hair's breadth of the Presidency. Fifteen hundred voters in New York State, who might easily have been swayed by any one of the factors mentioned above, could have given him the verdict. So close was the result that for nearly two weeks after Election Day the *Tribune* refused to concede defeat, while the New York vote was being checked. Godkin could not forbear a jibe at this constancy, and the *Post* commented of Reid's paper:

If it persists in declaring Blaine elected, there will be two inauguration ceremonies on March 4, one of Cleveland in Washington and one of Blaine on the steps of the *Tribune* building, the oath of office being administered by William Walter Phelps.

However, the *Tribune* gave in at last on November 17, and passed once more into the position of organ of the opposition.

"Agin the government" is a difficult role for any newspaper to sustain with dignity or credit. Criticism is proverbially easy; when directed at the party in power it readily becomes constructive, but the reproaches of opponents are but too apt to be deemed, and hence to become, mere partizan caviling. This is especially true in the absence of great questions to divide the nation. Practical unanimity on principle usually leads, in a two-party government, to bickering over details.

The *Tribune* was placed in this position during most of Cleveland's first Administration. Until December of 1887, the Republican case against the President was largely based on relatively minor errors in Cleveland's approach to routine problems of government.

The most fertile source of dissatisfaction was the Democratic management of the patronage. Cleveland's task in this respect was

enormous. The first Democratic President in over thirty years, his lean and hungry followers were avid for the fleshpots of office, while a powerful Republican press watched jealously. Moreover, his Mugwump support, in the words of Eugene Field's little jingle, was ready to "flirt its false, fantastic tail" and "soar away" at any concession to the spoilsmen.

The *Tribune* at first adopted an air of fairly benign skepticism. It remarked, after the inaugural, that it would be easy to dismiss the new President's speech as a "superabundance of agreeable commonplaces" but credited Cleveland with good intentions and hoped for the best.

The struggle for spoils was watched by the paper with considerable amusement. Cleveland was reported to be fond of pie at breakfast, whereupon the *Tribune* seized upon pie as a symbol for office and wove a series of domestic comedies about the distribution thereof. Conversations between Cleveland and Daniel Lamont, his private secretary, concerning the proper recipient for this White House delicacy were a feature of the *Tribune's* editorial page.

In a more serious vein, the *Tribune* summed up the President's shortcomings in the conduct of the Civil Service in a dissertation on the second anniversary of his inaugural. Entitled "Half Way Through," it took up nearly the whole of the *Tribune* for March 4, 1887. The errors of the Administration were neatly tabulated and forcibly denounced. Each dubious appointment was examined, and the total number of jail-birds, wife-beaters and similar undesirables duly set forth. The net result, in the *Tribune's* view, was that Cleveland had called for the resignation of more competent officials than any other President, and that many of his substitutes were "peculiarly offensive."

Apart from the questions of appointments and removals, in which Cleveland certainly erred somewhat, although not to the extent charged, the *Tribune* found little in the first two years of the Administration which would bolster an indictment. One episode, however, came in for considerable discussion and criticism—the attempt on the part of Cleveland to void the contracts for the cruisers of the White Squadron, which had been authorized by Arthur.

W. E. Chandler, Arthur's Secretary of the Navy, had awarded all of the contracts to shipbuilder John Roach, under conditions which seriously annoyed competing firms. The ships were constructed on plans drawn by naval architects of the Department, and while still unfinished had been subjected to severe criticism by observers, including the *Tribune*. When Cleveland came into office, the first of these vessels, the *Dolphin*, had been completed, and acceptance recommended by an advisory board. William C. Whitney, a close friend of Reid, became Cleveland's Secretary of the Navy, and ordered retrials. Early in 1885, the second board reversed the decision of its predecessor, and Attorney General Augustus H. Garland declared the contract unfulfilled, as well as illegal in the first place.

This placed Roach in an insupportable position. He went into bankruptcy and the government was forced to supervise the completion of the boats still on the stocks. In the upshot, it was decided that the structural defects of the *Dolphin* were due to its faulty design, and the government accepted the work of its own inept hands. This was too late to save Roach, who died at the beginning of 1887.

Though most of the blame for this fiasco rests upon Arthur's Navy Department, the Cleveland Administration had acted very brusquely. The *Tribune* accused it of wrecking an industry and placing the future of the navy in the hands of incompetent navy yards. Secretary Whitney proceeded to accomplish many reforms in his Department and contracts for new ships were let to several concerns with great care, but the cancellation of the Roach Contracts figured prominently in the *Tribune's* case against Cleveland.

Another item in the *Tribune's* bill of particulars had reached only a mildly vexatious stage at the halfway mark, but was destined to some importance later. This was the problem of the Canadian Fisheries. In 1885, Congress had abrogated the section of the Treaty of Washington dealing with the rights of Americans to purchase bait, to transship cargoes and to fish in Canadian territorial waters. The objections were directed at the high money payment demanded for inshore fishing privileges and the free admission of Canadian fish guaranteed in the treaty. Unguarded

by treaty, the American fishermen were subjected to annoying restrictions, and a clamor went up for retaliation which would coerce the Canadians into granting better treatment. Cleveland entered into negotiations in a conciliatory spirit, and was accused by the *Tribune* of subservience to Great Britain and "shilly-shallying." The spirit which had bred the White Squadron and the Nicaraguan Canal Treaty of 1884 was alert to resent any weakness in foreign affairs, and the groundwork for the nationalistic campaign of 1888 was laid.

Still the political picture was rather gray, in comparison with the vivid contrasting shades which had dominated since the war. Even the passions of the Stalwart era had an elemental strength when set beside these fine-spun issues of the Cleveland regime. Occasional dashes of color flecked the canvas—in 1887, Cleveland's Secretary of War ordered the return of the captured Confederate battle flags, and a momentary return to the bad old days of the Bloody Shirt ensued. The *Tribune* called the move "a slap in the face of every Union veteran"; the Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic bade God palsy Cleveland's members, but the episode passed without lasting effect.

Then, in his message to Congress on December 6, 1887, Grover Cleveland turned to the tariff. This subject had been bubbling under a lid since Arthur's Administration. The brief panic of 1885 had retired it for a time, but the renewed problem of surplus in the Treasury brought it again to the fore. Cleveland now removed the lid completely, attacking the existing laws as "the vicious, inequitable and illogical source of unnecessary taxation" and demanding that schedules be reduced as far as possible, considering the interests of the workingmen.

Here was a blazing issue after many chilly years. Though the *Tribune* questioned the advisability of a message devoted to but one subject, and naturally disapproved wholly of Cleveland's proposals, the paper responded with heartfelt gratitude to the call to arms. "Credit is due to the President for making the issue boldly and distinctly," it said editorially, and proceeded to exploit the opportunity vigorously. George W. Smalley hastened to Blaine in Paris and secured an interview replying forcibly to Cleveland's challenge. This country is a living proof of the fallacies of the

Manchester school, said the Maine statesman, touching the patriotic note which had been struck in the Fisheries dispute. The English, he continued, were naturally pleased at the hope of an enlarged market which Cleveland's message foreshadowed, but "a distinctly American" system was necessary in this country. Instead of lowering tariff rates, the surplus should be reduced by eliminating the internal tax on tobacco and devoting the remainder to coast defense.

This effective rejoinder was widely copied and gave new hope to the Republicans. Moreover, it called the tune for the campaign. Congress passed almost immediately into the debate on the Mills Tariff Bill, with side excursions into the Fisheries question. The Mills Bill failed, but provided ample material for the canvass, thereby serving its real purpose. A treaty on the Fisheries dispute was presented, which ironed out most of the difficulties, but several of the privileges granted American fishermen were made contingent upon the removal of duties upon Canadian fish. This linked the treaty with free trade as invasions of American rights, in the *Tribune's* view, and the paper said: "The campaign about to open will array English ideas against American ideas."

Blaine, after his strong start, yielded to chronic hypochondriasm and refused to continue in the Presidential race, to the *Tribune's* "keen disappointment." Whereupon the paper lost most of its interest in the contending candidates. Reid was conversant with the state of Blaine's mind, and the paper objected to plans to "conscript" him, turning to Chauncey M. Depew as first choice, but looking with favor upon Benjamin Harrison of Ohio. In any event, the paper was confident that the issue would be more significant than the man.

The Republican Convention proved this. Democratic papers commented upon the lack of enthusiasm among the delegates, which the *Tribune* admitted, asserting, however, that they were "Thinking instead of Shouting"—a somewhat overpowering conception. But, though the rocketing applause which had characterized previous conventions was missed, the platform was able to provoke an ovation. Said the *Tribune*:

Grand were the responses of affection and gratitude when the names of Lincoln, Grant, Garfield, Arthur and Sheridan were uttered. But

grander yet by far, according to the testimony of hostile witnesses, was the outburst of loyal feeling when Protection of American industries and rights was proclaimed as the principle which the Democratic party had assailed, and upon which the Republican party appeals to the people.

Harrison was chosen on the eighth ballot by the Republicans, and Cleveland was renominated, almost as a matter of course, by his party. The country plunged again into a Presidential campaign. It was a curiously intellectual one, with personalities at a discount and ideas prominent. Despite much flag-waving, the tariff did not lend itself to the emotionalism of the "Bloody Shirt" of 1880, or the "Moral Issue" of 1884, and the question in dispute was thrashed out with considerable thoroughness. It was a campaign in which a paper of the type of the *Tribune* showed to good advantage. A Protectionist tradition going back to its foundation had bred up writers to handle the problem so that even so prosy a subject might emit sparks. If the personal enthusiasm for a candidate that had characterized the canvass of four years ago were lacking, the *Tribune* made up for it in the clear and forceful presentation of ideas.

The end of the contest brought out a semihumorous incident of the type of Burchard's famous speech—save that the Republicans had a hand in the later episode, whereas Burchard, presumably, was moved to his indiscretion by Providence. On October 4, the *Los Angeles Times* published a letter from Lord Sackville-West, British Minister at Washington, in reply to the inquiry of one Charles Murchison, avowedly a naturalized American of English birth, as to the probable attitude of the two candidates toward Great Britain. Tactlessly enough, Sackville-West responded that he believed Cleveland would be conciliatory. A great furore broke out; the *Tribune* called the Minister's action "nothing less than an affront to the dignity and intelligence of the American people," and Cleveland, after some hesitation, sent Sackville-West his passport. The *World* accused him of acting only under pressure from Democratic bosses, and the *Tribune* carried this charge, double-leaded, for several days at the head and foot of the editorial page. It fitted most aptly into that paper's thesis that Cleveland was un-American.

The popular response of the nation to the campaign proved

disappointing to ardent Republicans, since Cleveland attained a plurality, but Harrison received a majority in the electoral college. On the morning following the election, the *Tribune* carried a large cut of a tombstone, inscribed with a doggerel epitaph headed: "All is over with Free Trade Grover." As prophecy, it was unfortunate; but, for the present, the Republicans were back in power, and the *Tribune* was at a crisis in its career.

For, though Benjamin Harrison was President, Blaine was still the outstanding man in the party, and Reid had been his foremost supporter. Moreover, the *Tribune*, independently of its connection with Blaine, was the chief Republican newspaper in the country, and it was clear that some recognition of services rendered was due. In a word, the offer of Hayes was to be renewed. Circumstances had changed with Reid since 1878. He was ten years older, married and independent. His paper had achieved a position of apparent security, the lines of policy had been clearly marked and a veteran organization seemed to promise efficient management. Finally, the editor's health had suffered in the strenuous fight to reach the stability that now was assured. He was in a mood to be receptive to the allure of diplomacy.

Reid's desire was the mission to London. But Blaine, whom Harrison had somewhat reluctantly given the headship of the State Department, pointed out to John Hay that the *Tribune* had generally taken the Liberal side in its discussions of English politics, which might embarrass Reid's relations with the Conservative Government then in power. The French mission, Blaine felt, would be equally satisfactory to the editor, and its acceptance would help still the whispers of Republican dissension which had arisen from Harrison's delay in bringing Blaine into the Cabinet.¹⁷

Reid agreed to take the post. His erstwhile private secretary, Donald Nicholson, was put in charge of the paper, and on April 20, 1889, the following card appeared on the *Tribune's* editorial page:

Mr. Whitelaw Reid, having taken office abroad, under the Government, retires herewith from the editorship and direction of the *Tribune*.

CHAPTER XI

ENTER THE YELLOW PRESS

WHITELAW REID was Minister to France but three years, yet his acceptance of that post marked the end of his undivided attention to the *Tribune*. Though he retained the title of editor-in-chief until his departure as Ambassador to Great Britain in 1906, and though his personality and ideas dominated the paper until his death, the routine management of the *Tribune* during the remainder of his life was largely in other hands. It is substantially true, as Henry Watterson said, that Reid abandoned journalism for diplomacy in 1889.¹

Domestic politics and ill health had a part in severing Reid from that complete absorption in the work of the paper which had made up his life for twenty years. Upon his return from France in 1892, he was plunged into political activity. First he presided over the Republican State Convention in April of that year, then he was nominated for the Vice-Presidency, and made speaking tours on behalf of the ticket. Then in 1894, followed an attempt to reorganize the Republicans of New York County and a consequent battle royal with Thomas Collier Platt. In the winter of that year, Reid found that an asthmatic condition had become critical, and made a dry climate imperative. His friends were alarmed and believed that his chances were slim, but Reid set out resolutely to battle the disease. In 1894, he went to North Africa, where he found some relief. The two winters following saw him at Phoenix, Arizona, where an almost complete cure was effected. Nevertheless, Reid was frequently impelled to seek a purer air and more restful atmosphere than that of Park Row or Madison Avenue, and spent much of his time at Ophir Hall, his beautiful estate in Westchester County, at Millbrae, his father-in-law's California home, or at his lodge in the Adirondacks.

In 1896 he went to London as Special Ambassador at the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria; in 1898 he was in Paris as a

member of the Peace Commission which brought the Spanish American War to a close; in 1902 he represented this country again at the coronation of Edward VII; and finally, in 1906, he formally ended his journalistic career in becoming Ambassador to the Court of St. James. In addition to these activities he served as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, a position he had assumed in 1878, becoming Vice Chancellor in 1902 and Chancellor in 1903. His interest in education also led him to serve on the Board of Trustees at Leland Stanford and the Advisory Board of the Columbia School of Journalism, as well as to give numerous addresses and lectures to educational institutions, such as the initial series of Bromley Lectures at Yale.

These manifold activities and frequent absences suggest the latter days of Greeley's career. But Greeley was wont to leave his paper in charge of men of energy and individual force who often wrested it into channels which the editor never intended. It was either Reid's misfortune, or more probably his policy, to foster a different breed—capable subordinates, well acquainted with his aims and methods, but unwilling to attempt to impress their own personalities upon the *Tribune*.

In this respect Reid differed from two other absentee owners of newspapers. James Gordon Bennett governed with sporadic harshness a group of capable men, held more or less in line by fear of a "shake-up," with much intraoffice tattling. Pulitzer used a form of the same technique, with more constant pressure and supervision. Reid's assistants were not subjected to the tension of the arbitrary shake-up, for the editor of the *Tribune* ruled by moral force. He wrote frequently to the office and watched its progress intently, but he expected and received obedience without recourse to punishment.

It is difficult to appraise the relative merits of these systems. Pulitzer was undoubtedly the more successful during his lifetime, but this is probably to be ascribed to the fact that his theories of journalism had greater "viability" than those of his contemporaries. For Reid continued to cling to the prospectus he had submitted in 1879—of a paper of brains. Complicated as this was by his belief in journalistic partizanship of a sort which would

now be considered extreme, and which prevented the *Tribune* under his control from scoring the success achieved by Ochs with the *Times*, the paper's field was necessarily restricted to people of a certain culture with pronounced Republican leanings. There was little to attract the crowd.

John Hay referred to Reid's remote control of the paper as "making a long arm."² The men who served as the hand of this "long arm" were a distinctive group in metropolitan journalism. Their leader was Donald Nicholson, a benevolent, full-bearded Welshman. Nicholson had been Reid's private secretary for some ten years or more when, about 1882, John R. G. Hassard was incapacitated by ill health. (He died in 1888, deeply regretted by his associates.) Nicholson then took over the duties of managing editor, and was nominally in charge during Reid's absences. Unlike his predecessor, he did little writing for the paper, but was purely an executive. In this position he was assisted by an intimate knowledge of Reid's principles and technique, and by the affection of his subordinates, who appreciated his kindly manner.

No great executive ability was required to keep the *Tribune* on its set course at this time. The editorial staff was made up of veterans, trained to function along certain lines. Most of the men of the Greeley period had vanished, of course. In addition to Hassard, Charles Tabor Congdon retired in 1882 after twenty-five years of service. That charmingly erratic personage had seen history made on Park Row, but his later years were mostly spent away from the office. He died in 1891.

Eighteen eighty-two witnessed another departure from the editorial fold of the *Tribune*, but this was happily only temporary. In that year, Isaac Bromley left, to return again in 1891. He then remained with the paper until his death in 1898, contributing a notable series of editorials on Cleveland fishing for votes in Buzzard's Bay, as well as a sarcastic attack on Gene Debs for his activity in the Pullman Strike. During "Brom's" absence his place as humorous commentator was filled by a young man whom Reid discovered in the unpromising guise of editor of the *Estelline Bell*, a small weekly in Dakota Territory. Hayden Carruth was summarily brought East, where his witty articles brightened the editorial page from 1888 to 1892.

In 1883, Joseph Bucklin Bishop also left the *Tribune*, transferring his pen to the *Evening Post*. He later became a close friend of Theodore Roosevelt, the author of his official biography and chairman of the Panama Canal Commission.

Among those who remained during the period of the 'nineties was Colonel William Grosvenor, financial writer for the *Tribune*. One of his younger colleagues on the paper was Hart Lyman, who, retiring and scholarly, was destined to be the successor of Greeley and Reid, the third editor-in-chief of the *Tribune*. Lyman joined the editorial staff in 1876 at the age of twenty-five. He was a graduate of Yale, class of '73, had studied at Berlin and Heidelberg and read law at Minneapolis. Conscientious and trustworthy, he substituted for Donald Nicholson during the latter's absences, but his natural bent was toward editorial writing. Well equipped by education for this task, he was an able if not a brilliant writer on national themes until his unexpected elevation to the editorship in 1906.

Willis Fletcher Johnson was added to the *Tribune* editorial staff in 1880, almost immediately upon his graduation from New York University, and at his death had completed over forty years of service to the paper. His speciality was international relations, upon which he wrote with a facility that occasionally led him to overrun his objectives, in the military phrase. Dr. Johnson's cheery disposition was cherished by his colleagues, especially by those who appreciated the patient courage which it evidenced.

Roscoe C. E. Brown, later managing editor during the regency of Hart Lyman, became a reporter on the paper in 1889. He was the son of Dyer D. S. Brown, editor of the *Rochester Democrat*, and after graduation from the University of Rochester, gravitated naturally into journalism. After a brief interlude at space rates, he was assigned to cover Brooklyn police court news. While on this beat, Brown made his mark during the exposure of the Long Island water supply frauds, and was given various executive positions—exchange night and day editor, assistant day editor and assistant to Miss Hutchinson on the Sunday edition. Like Lyman, however, he had a decided proclivity for the more scholarly atmosphere of the editorial page, to which he was eventually translated in 1894. His principal subject was state politics, which was

of paramount importance in the *Tribune* of the 'nineties, and he treated it *con amore* and with great success.

Brown's predecessor in the field of state politics was Lemuel Eli Quigg, one of the most capable journalists which the paper developed in this period. He had been given a place on the paper about 1885, and soon became star correspondent and an editorial writer of considerable force. Rather imposing in presence, with an intimidating conversational trick of emphasizing his points by a stabbing forefinger, Quigg possessed a terse and effective literary style and the knack of accumulating obscure facts. He was one of the few *Tribune* men of the time permitted to write over their own initials, and his special articles on the West Indies and the "New States" of the Northwest were prominently featured. He was fond of the devious minutiae of politics, however, and wrote much of the Republican campaign literature while still on the paper. From comment and observation he drifted into active participation and was elected to Congress in 1894. He came into Tom Platt's orbit, and, after his brief Congressional career, edited the *New York Press* in that worthy's interest. After Platt's death, Quigg withdrew to the private practice of law.

The intimate connection between journalism and politics which Quigg represented was revealed by two other members of the *Tribune* staff. Roswell G. Horr was one of the paper's financial writers, a specialist on questions of currency. During the Free Silver controversy he often took the stump for the Gold Standard, being assigned on one occasion to debate with William H. Harvey, the author of *Coin's Financial School*, to "check the madness of which that book is the source." John F. Milholland had an even more immediate contact with politics. He served as Reid's liaison officer with the New York County organization, or as it was phrased in less kindly fashion, as Reid's "messenger boy." Milholland was the spearhead of the *Tribune's* attack on Platt in the city area, and received much of the battering incidental to that position.

The page which resulted from the efforts of this band of writers was, as may be imagined, well written and scholarly, but decidedly political in tone. Each writer was versed in the traditional policies of his paper, and, each having his own speciality, there was little

difficulty in coördinating the group. No joint conferences were held, though individual interviews with Reid or Nicholson were sometimes in order. The articles were prepared separately, usually without previous consultation or assignment, and submitted to the managing editor. If Reid were in town, the proofs were sent to him about nine in the evening. It was a pleasant system, functioning smoothly, on the whole, without much need for violent activity by the editor or his manager.

Sometimes, however, the difficulty of long range management became apparent. One such occasion was the publication of President Cleveland's Venezuela Message. The *Tribune* had long chafed under the peaceful policy of the Cleveland Administration; Cleveland's rejection of the proffered annexation of Hawaii had seemed to confirm the paper's opinion, formed during his first Administration, that the President was lax in upholding the prestige of this country abroad. Suddenly, on December 3, 1895, Cleveland's message to Congress asserted the right of the United States to settle the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela and threatened, quite distinctly, the use of force to establish our decree.

The *Tribune's* first reception of this news was jubilant. The President "could hardly have adopted the *Tribune's* view more completely, or have expressed it more exactly, if he had copied one of our editorials as part of his message," said the paper on December 4. But Reid, in Arizona, was not so completely convinced. The financial section of New York was greatly perturbed; Chauncey M. Depew wrote him that Morgan, Lanier and Sturgis, President of the Stock Exchange, foresaw a major panic at the news. Reid found the President's claim that the British must accept the findings of an American commission "needlessly offensive," and dispatched instructions to the office to that effect:

A man who merely wanted to maintain the Monroe Doctrine, and the honor of the country, not also to further personal or political interests, and who also had the sincere desire every statesman ought to have for peace if it can be had with honor, might, it strikes me, have found a less offensive way of convincing Great Britain that there was a point beyond which she could not go without breaking with us. And to convince her of that, it seems to me, was all that was really necessary.³

The *Tribune* thereupon, while maintaining a general agreement with the tone of the Message, urged that the country "Keep Cool," and stated that the President

. . . unfortunately, with the blundering excess of new-found zeal himself prejudices the case, declares in advance that Great Britain is in the wrong and seeks to appoint a commission merely to ratify that judgment.

This was a plain case of editorial second thought, but such instances were rare in the well-disciplined *Tribune*.

The news policy of the *Tribune* had not greatly altered since the days of Reid's first accession to the high command. The thoughtful survey rather than the "beat" was still the goal, and the practice had grown up of sending members of the editorial staff to cover important stories or to fill the permanent bureaus. For example, when the Lizzie Borden trial was on, Lemuel Quigg was sent from his desk to report it—with great success. And when, in 1895, George W. Smalley resigned his position with the *Tribune* to become Washington correspondent of the *London Times*, Isaac N. Ford was detailed to take over the London Bureau. Ford had been in the office since the early 'seventies and he fulfilled his new duties with distinction, if not with that brilliance with which Smalley's decisive personality and long acquaintanceship with the European scene had invested them.

Among the Washington correspondents were two men of note. E. V. Smalley went into the service of the Northern Pacific railroad in 1882, and was succeeded by David Demarest Lloyd. Though he only held the position for a year, Lloyd's dispatches had a thoroughgoing quality and clear, thoughtful style which were impressive. From 1883 to 1902, Max G. Seckendorff was the *Tribune's* representative at the capital. He was a German of noble family (his brother, Count Seckendorff, was Chamberlain to the Empress Victoria) who had come to this country as a young man. His gracious manner, tinged with just a shade of Junker arrogance, as well as his connections, secured a ready entrée into social and official Washington. McKinley and Roosevelt were exceptionally frank in their relations with Seckendorff, and his capture by Munsey in 1902 was a real loss to the paper. His death occurred in 1911.

The post of Albany correspondent was an important one in the *Tribune* during the last century, especially at the time of the long-drawn-out fight with Platt. During the 'nineties Edgar L. Murlin, the present Assistant-Librarian of the New York Court of Appeals, was active there, providing the editorial writers with the ammunition to assail the "Easy Boss."

The news reports of the *Tribune* bureaus were amplified, of course, by those of the news services. These latter, during the 'nineties, were engaged in a chaotic warfare in which Whitelaw Reid took a prominent part. In 1882 an attempt was made to meet the long-standing grievances of the Western Associated Press by giving it representation on a joint executive committee of the Western and New York Associations. Charles A. Dana was made chairman of this committee, and Reid was selected as one of the representatives of the New York group.

This brought the two old enemies in rather close association. At first both were very formal. "Without any greeting they solemnly and scrupulously transacted their business." But as the meetings of the committee continued, this reserve thawed, and the editors "reached a point of friendly coöperation";⁴ indeed the *Sun* and the *Tribune* became close allies for a period of some fifteen years in matters relating to the press service.

The executive committee kept the differences between the New York and Western Associations composed for nearly ten years. Meanwhile, a rival service, the United Press, began to offer serious competition, and the committee arranged a formal truce and union of interests. Whitelaw Reid and William F. Laffan, Dana's publisher, became stockholders in the United Press, and eventually the old New York association became merged in this newer group, the Western papers incorporating their service in Illinois as the Associated Press.

The jealousy between East and West continued, and in 1894 flared into open warfare. Each group tried to raid into the enemies' territory, to secure exclusive contracts with other services and generally to drive its rival to the wall. It was an expensive battle, especially for the United Press, and finally on March 27, most of its New York members, including the *Tribune*, went over to the Associated. Laffan remained obdurate, however, and, though

the United Press was dissolved shortly after, the *Sun* remained outside the Associated Press and conducted its own news service until the paper was purchased by Frank A. Munsey in 1916.⁵

Local news on the *Tribune* from 1880 until about 1901 or '02, was in charge of City Editor Arthur Bowers. He—tall, handsome and overbearing—was the city editor of legend, brusque and imperious to his subordinates. He had an incurable weakness for the turf and was present at almost every metropolitan race meeting. Even in this pursuit, however, he was not wholly forgetful of his duty to the paper, for he did the race reports, and in a distinctive fashion. Bowers possessed a rich and allusive style which translated the drama of racing into essays which are still exciting reading—though the track at Sheepshead Bay is cut up into apartment houses, small dwellings and vacant lots, and Tod Sloan's fine house is an orphanage.

Even in Bowers' department, the political element was strong. Local meetings were described in terms calculated to keep alight the fires of true Republicanism in the reader's breast; interviews were often colored in the same direction, just as they had been for decades past. The principle that partizanship should be confined to the editorial page is still to be completely realized; in 1890 it was practically unheard of.

In certain respects, however, the news policy of the *Tribune* had been modernized. "Human interest" crept into its pages; interviews became more interpretive, and the rigidity of the "Grocer's Bill" style of reporting was relaxed to permit a frequent vein of humor. An illustration of this altered state of affairs is provided by the issue of April 21, 1899. At that time it was proposed to raise funds for the subway system by popular subscription, and certain offers of large sums for the purpose had aroused the skeptical amusement of the press. Among the rest was that of Mirabeau L. Towns, a Brooklyn lawyer of exceeding brilliance, but with a weakness for the spectacular. His habit of summing up before the jury in verse and his tendency to appear in sensational cases made him the target of much publicity. Towns signed up for a million in bonds, and immediately (though it appears, unjustly) the papers suspected a jape. Towns was pestered by reporters, and the *Tribune's* account was amusing enough to arouse

some comment in the other journals. The *Tribune* man represented everybody—the Towns office cat, the cigar store wooden Indian—as asking whence came the million. Even the mops of the scrub-women were twisted into interrogation points. A man from Yaphank, the story continued, tried to get Towns to finance his invention, a machine for generating electricity. The reporter asked what luck he'd had, and the disconsolate genius replied:

Well, he said I could go soak my head as several newspapers had sent machines to his office, and they had done nothin' but generate hades for him fur the last twenty-four hours and he didn't want no more of nothin'.

It might be remarked that Towns was described as a "Silver Democrat." The *Tribune's* wealthy local clientèle was fastidious and the paper was cautious of offense. The language was strictly guarded and the numerous "sacred cows" respected. This was inevitable in a political paper of class circulation, and is certainly no more offensive than the extreme publicity given to the peccadilloes of social lions by the yellow sheets.

Of all the departments in the *Tribune*, that least affected by the conditions of absentee management was the one devoted to criticism. It had ever been Reid's policy to give his literary, dramatic, art and music critics a free rein, and if these partook of the general conservative tone of the paper, it is to be ascribed either to their selection on that ground or the intangible atmosphere of the Tall Tower. Withal, it was, in perspective, the most successful section of the paper. As James Huneker, the versatile critic of the *Sun*, whose tastes ran counter in most respects to those of his confreres on the *Tribune*, said, the combination of William Winter, dramatic editor, Henry Krehbiel, music critic, and Royal Cortissoz, art critic and book reviewer, was "difficult to beat. In fact, it wasn't beaten." ⁶

William Winter, at the beginning of the Mauve Decade, was at the height of his fame. Born in 1836, he graduated from Harvard Law School and set up his shingle for a brief space as an attorney. But the appeal of the theater was stronger than that of the courts, and in 1861 he became literary and dramatic reviewer of the *New York Albion*. In 1865, as noted earlier, he went over to the *Tribune*.

The prevailing mood of Winter's personality was a gentle melancholy, which frequently pervaded his writings. Indeed, some of his finest work, in point of style, was in the nature of tributes to departed friends, such as his splendid eulogies of Hassard and Bromley. This trait earned him the nickname of "Weeping Willie" among the unregenerate, for his "lachrymose lyrical propensities," as Huneker put it.⁷ In his later years, friends were inclined to ascribe Winter's disposition to grief at the death of his son in 1886, but that tragedy could only have intensified a tendency which had been evident to Amos Cummings in 1868.⁸ A more exact classification of his state of mind would be that of "Romantic Melancholy," which had plagued young intellectuals of the early nineteenth century. In fact, it was suspected by those close to him that Winter enjoyed his moods.

This disarming characteristic covered both a real fund of affection and good fighting powers. He was respected and loved by his intimates and feared by those who came under his biting critical lash. Occasionally this spirit manifested itself in his relations with the paper. Once during a stay in California, he submitted a lengthy essay, only part of which could, with great difficulty, be inserted by one of his colleagues. On his return, Winter sought out the guilty one and roared, "What damned fool has mutilated my copy?" When, however, the circumstances were explained, he immediately placed a contrite arm around the other's shoulder and apologized profusely.

Winter's taste in drama ran to the Romantic School, especially to the fountainhead, Shakespeare. Conservative to the core, he rejected the realistic school of Ibsen and his followers with vehemence. He found it "dull and tiresome" and termed Ibsen "this Norwegian crank." Apart from artistic considerations, the newer playwrights offended Winter's profound and sensitive moral scruples. He refused to accept the portrayal of deviations from the accepted code either for art's sake or the purpose of example. Witness his terse comment on *Clito*, in which Wilson Barrett appeared in 1887:

This play is a moral fraud. It purports to rebuke vice by painting vice. This involves once more the stale pretence, Gallic in its origin, that everything in possible human nature which is vile, and everything in

possible human life which is loathsome ought to be shown in works of art in order that it may thereby be rebuked and condemned. This is a mere expedient for opening the doors to an alluring display of voluptuousness. No moral purpose is really designed and no such result is really accomplished.

As a matter of fact, Winter opposed all didacticism in the theater. The actor, he wrote, is not a teacher. "The province of the Stage is Art, and the handmaidens of Art are Beauty and Romance." Acting should make its spectators "happier than they were before seeing it" and "leave their hearts uplifted and their minds refreshed." It should depict great characters, or at least worthy characters, in dramatic situations. He objected almost equally to the gloomy tragedy of *Electra*, to the mysticism of *The Sunken Bell*, and to the problems presented in *Magda*, *Ghosts*, and *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. But he also vehemently denounced the "theatrical janitors," the managers who regarded the stage as an "amusement" and the theater as a "shop." His ideal among the later playwrights was Augustus Thomas, and he did not hesitate to apply the term great to *The Witching Hour*.

Winter's resolute conservatism in the art and morals of the theater was shared by another fine old Tory of the New York press, James Rankin Towse of the *Evening Post*. Towse was credited with sounder judgment in the evaluation of plays, while Winter was unquestionably one of the finest critics of the technique of acting in the city. He was much averse to the "star" system, as leading to performances by one real actor amid a collection of "sticks" in minor roles, and as stifling that valuable nursery of young actors, the stock company. Winter also had a strong bias in favor of the Anglo-Saxon theater, being quite convinced that no German, and especially no Italian or Frenchman could interpret Shakespeare for American audiences. Thus men like Tommaso Salvini or Charles Fechter found scant comfort in the *Tribune's* pages during their American tours. Indeed, Winter's reception of Fechter was so chilly that pressure was brought to bear on Reid to muzzle his critic—which Reid naturally refused to do.

The style of Winter's reviews was, to quote Huneker, "Augustan." Each one marched in ordered prose, vigorous but uncol-

loquial. His rivals of the press were frequently amazed by the polished essays which appeared in the *Tribune*, for they knew that Winter lived in Staten Island, and usually caught a ferry-boat shortly after the close of each performance. But Winter's acquaintanceship with the repertories of the leading actors was so complete that he was able to write several thousand words about the play before the performance, leaving space for inter-lineations dealing with the particular interpretation of the evening.⁹

Winter died June 30, 1917, at the age of eighty, but his long connection with the *Tribune* had been severed eight years before that by a regrettable misunderstanding—forty-four years and one month, almost to the day, from the time he had written his first criticism for the paper.

Henry Krehbiel, the second in seniority in the *Tribune's* critical triumvirate of the 'nineties, succeeded Hassard as music critic in 1880. Educated in the law, like Winter, at the age of twenty he took over the musical department of Reid's old paper, the *Cincinnati Gazette*, in 1874. When he first came to the *Tribune*, Krehbiel was a stately figure of a man, handsome, with the curly blond hair of a Viking; indeed, his early nickname was "the Norse God." As time went on, the *Tribune's* musical oracle became portly and Nestorian, and the affectionate title of "Papa" Krehbiel was his portion.

The 'eighties and 'nineties were strenuous days in the world of music. Opera was the principal theme of musical discussion, and the Wagnerian controversy was still in full blast. Though not a fanatical Wagnerite, Krehbiel could generally be found on that side, for he strove to encourage a native American music and believed that the German, through racial affinity, was the better tutor. Liberal in his consideration of new musical forms, Krehbiel shared Winter's sensitivity to the ethical elements involved in music drama. He was convinced, for instance, that *Tannhäuser* was far superior to *Tristan* as a dramatic poem because of the moral lesson it inculcated, and the perverse sensuality of Richard Strauss's *Salome* interfered sadly with his estimate of the musical value of the work.

Krehbiel wrote a flexible and emotional prose, and was conscientious in analysis. He found the alluring gossip of the Metropolitan in the golden age of its youth intriguing, and devoted much space to the colorful personalities of that famous stage.

Krehbiel did not neglect the symphony, however, and the American interest in choral music (exemplified by many "Handel Societies") found in him a sympathetic and authoritative interpreter. Like his two associates, Winter and Cortisoz, he lived to become dean of his guild, his death in 1923 terminating forty-three years of service on the *Tribune*.

The youngest of the Three Musketeers, and the only one now living, was Royal Cortisoz. The art criticism of the *Tribune* had been in the competent hands of James Ripley Wellman Hitchcock from 1882 until 1890. Hitchcock had studied art at Harvard and medicine in New York, but preferred to expound the former. This he did in voluntary contributions to the press, so successfully that he was taken on as Clarence Cook's successor. Ripley Hitchcock, as he later preferred to be called, acted as special correspondent of the paper as well, in the Northwest, New Mexico, Arizona, California and Mexico. In 1890 he became literary adviser to D. Appleton and Company, and in 1891 Cortisoz took his place as art critic of the *Tribune*.

In 1897, upon his marriage to Ellen Mackay Hutchinson, the literary section which had been hers also fell to Cortisoz's share. But though he retained this department until 1913, when he abandoned it in order to have more leisure for the production of his biography of Whitelaw Reid, it is as art critic that he is known. Short, dapper and unfailingly courteous, Cortisoz has been described, and justly, as "a ripe scholar and a master of colored prose."¹⁰ His contribution to art remains to be assessed, but he has supplied a clear statement of his own critical yardstick in his book *American Artists*. It is implicit in all his writings on art:

I am a conservative. I believe that through all the mutations of schools and traditions, for many centuries, art has recognized the validity of certain fundamental laws. I believe in the art that is faithful to these laws, that means a sane vision of nature and an honest craftsmanship. I disbelieve in modernism because it seems to me to flout fundamental

laws and to repudiate what I take to be the function of art, the creation of beauty. If modernism has anything legitimate to substitute for the experience of the past, it is under obligation to make a convincing demonstration; the burden of proof rests with the innovators.¹¹

In addition to his regular critical functions, Cortissoz has enjoyed the confidence of the Reid family; he is, in fact, the jealous guardian of its tradition and that of the *Tribune*. He is the senior officer of the *Herald Tribune* organization, one of the few living links to the past, still constant in his rounds of the galleries and furiously active as his page is about to go to press. May he long frequent his lofty, book-lined office on the eleventh floor!

This, in outline, was the personnel which Reid trusted to carry on in his absence. It was well fitted to conserve the tradition which he had built up since 1872, to be the hand at the end of his "long arm." But men had arisen to challenge that tradition; disturbing signs of the passing of the older journalism were in evidence. During the 'eighties and 'nineties one of those violent pulsations took place in the New York press which have affected it periodically, changing the patterns radically.

It was in 1879 that Reid had spoken of the fortune awaiting the man who would make a paper "as disreputable and vile as a hundred and fifty thousand readers would be willing to buy." On May 11, 1883, there appeared in the columns of the staid but mistrusted (it was owned outright by Jay Gould) *New York World*, an announcement by a certain Joseph Pulitzer that he had assumed complete control of that moribund sheet, and felt that there was room in the city for a paper "that is not only cheap but bright, not only bright but large, not only large but truly democratic." And in a short time, the editors of the great dailies believed that the man had arrived to seize the opportunity which Reid had indicated.

The methods by which Pulitzer and his imitator, William Randolph Hearst, dipped into the strata of newspaper readers which the older editors left untouched were threefold. In the first place, both, at the outset, set up as the champions of the workingman, politically and socially, whereas practically all the existing press were conservative papers of middle-class circulation. Pulitzer, for instance, though he later repented somewhat, supported the

workers in the Homestead Strike of 1892, and, shortly after taking over the *World*, came out in favor of a program including the taxing of luxuries, inheritances, large incomes, monopolies and privileged corporations; tariff for revenue; reform of the Civil Service; punishment of corrupt officers, vote buyers and "Employers who coerce their Employees in elections." Hearst on his side was the only New York newspaper proprietor of importance who supported Bryan in 1896; he attacked the "Trusts" consistently, and was long the champion of government ownership of public utilities.

In addition to appealing to a different class politically, Pulitzer preached a gospel of news which was quite different from that which Reid had expressed in 1879. This, as summarized in a "Memo" to his managing editor in 1910, after its practical utility had been amply recognized, was the answer to Reid's plea for a paper with brains. The editor was told to concentrate upon:

What is original, distinctive, dramatic, romantic, thrilling, unique, curious, quaint, humorous, odd, apt to be talked about, without shocking good taste or lowering the general tone, good tone, and above all without impairing the confidence of the people in the truth of the stories or the character of the paper for reliability and scrupulous cleanness.

Further, Pulitzer bade his manager:

When you come to serious heavy matter, towards which you have a manifest bent, please exercise your faculty by putting on the headlines, however roughly, merely guessing the percentage of *World* readers apt to read things on corruption, graft, politics, legal dissertation, flabby interviews with nobodies.¹²

The connotation is obvious. The press of Pulitzer and Hearst tended to become more and more a vehicle of amusement and entertainment under this definition of "news"; and other papers were dragged in its wake, for more of the public was willing to pay to be amused, or at least receive their instruction sugar-coated, than would buy the straight didacticism of the older journalism.

The third element in the success of the "yellow" press was sensationalism, related to the second but depending more on the manner of presentation. Headlines, which had been modest one-column affairs, with the subheads tastefully worked into inverted

triangles, now began to crawl across the page in huge block letters, until, by 1898, the front pages of the *World* and of Hearst's *Journal* resembled nothing so much as the placards carried by English newsboys. "Ideas" were at a premium; extrajournalistic feats—such as Pulitzer's fund to provide for the completion of the Statue of Liberty, or Hearst's petition for the release of the Cuban "martyr," Evangelina Cisneros, and the subsequent dramatic release of that persecuted maiden—followed one another in rapid succession, with much typographical absurdity but steadily mounting gains in circulation. Illustrations were added to set off the screaming letterpress; after Pulitzer's first cartoon in 1884, the art of propagandist draftsmanship was added permanently to the daily newspaper scheme. Line cut illustrations were followed by half-tone reproductions of photographs; the "comic strip" was evolved, adding vivid color to the Sunday sections. The papers grew from a modest eight or twelve pages to forty in the daily and one hundred on Sundays. And still the circulation grew.

The effect on the established papers such as the *Tribune* was painful. The new journalism was founded on cheap mass circulation, with advertising footing the bills; whereas, previous to 1889, the revenue from circulation, over American newspapers as a whole, had exceeded that from advertising. After that year, the advertisers began to contribute an ever greater proportion of the receipts.¹³ The *World* was a two cent paper at the time Pulitzer took it over. So was the little four-page *Sun*, while the *Herald* was three cents, and the *Times* and *Tribune* retained the war-time price of four cents. Four months after Pulitzer entered the New York field, on September 18, 1883, the *Times* dropped its rate to two cents; the next day Reid came down to three cents, and, on September 25, the *Herald* met the *World's* price by a drop to two cents. Dana's *Sun* was still in a strong position but lost half of its circulation through its editor's support of Benjamin Butler for the Presidency on the Greenback ticket in 1884. By 1888, the *World* was supreme in the metropolitan area, with a circulation of 189,830 daily, 99,412 weekly and 253,692 on Sundays—probably about twice the gross circulation of either the *Sun* or the *Herald*.¹⁴

The *Tribune* followed the lead of the dashing *World* with great

reluctance. For this, the principal reason probably lies in Reid's ingrained dislike for shrieking headlines and cheap, sensational features. His associates either had similar tastes or were unwilling to take the initiative. Still, the *Tribune* did change noticeably during the 'nineties.

Not in its political aspects, of course. Conservative Republicanism was too ingrained an element of the paper's constituency, as well as too vital an adjunct of Reid's personal career, to be lightly sloughed off or seriously modified. But, as has been noted, the news policy was humanized and in several respects the manner of its presentation colored to suit the times. The size of the paper increased to 14 pages daily, and 50 on Sunday. Headlines increased in size, though the most radical heads during the typographical insanity of the Spanish American War were only two columns wide and about three-quarters of an inch deep. A few flags and some rather poor patriotic poetry set in decorated borders were the *Tribune's* limit in display.

Line cuts were used frequently after 1883; a daily political cartoon by Leon Barrett began on July 10, 1899, and on January 21, 1897, a portrait of Thomas Collier Platt marked the first use of the half-tone process for photographic reproduction in a daily newspaper. This innovation resulted from the experiments of Stephen H. Horgan, a former art director on the *Herald*. Horgan had submitted his idea to the younger Bennett, who, after seeking expert advice, was convinced that the notion of applying half-tone screens to the curved stereotype plates was impractical. This shook his confidence in his art director and Horgan was presently out of a job. He applied to Reid with better success, and a fine facsimile of Platt's foxy features eventuated.¹⁵

"Sunday Supplements," in the modern sense, first appeared in the *Tribune* of November 8, 1896, in the form of a "serio-comic Weekly" called *Twinkles*. This was a curious mélange of 16 pages of glazed stock, headed by a colored political cartoon. An "editorial" explained the cartoon, in rather English fashion, and the rest of the supplement was composed of comic cartoons and articles, photographs of social lights, and political comment in the lighter vein. *Twinkles* had a short life, being succeeded on May 30, 1897, by a regular Illustrated Supplement of more conven-

tional form—feature articles, illustrated by line cuts and photographs, with a few jokes, usually scissored from humorous publications. In this form the Supplement ran on until it was replaced by the Sunday Magazine.

Another feature introduced about 1896 was "The Only Woman's Page." This appeared daily, and was designed to combat the assumption, implied in the usual Women's section, that the sex were "silly and mindless creatures." Fashions and social notes were amplified by news of the women's clubs and of civic movements that would interest them, thus, in the *Tribune's* own words, appealing to "neither absurd and pedantic blue stockings on the one hand, nor brainless chatterers on the other hand." This page won the commendation of both Frances Willard and the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

In promotional ideas of the "service" type (Milk Funds, One Hundred Neediest Cases, etc.) the *Tribune* was one of the first in the field with its Fresh Air work, but so dignified was the paper's conduct of this worthy object that it is only remotely akin to the "ideas" of the yellow journals. The Fresh Air Fund has a long tradition. In 1878, "A Friend" sent \$500 to the editor of the *Tribune* for the purpose of providing "sick children with fresh air, or sending saleswomen to the seashore." The money was utilized to dispatch a group of little invalids to a sanatorium at Rockaway. The following year, a stranger from New England visited Reid and presented him with a thousand dollars for the relief of "real distress" in New York City. After some discussion, and with the coöperation of the Children's Aid Society, the sum was used as the nucleus of a fund to send destitute boys from the city to Western farms. With suitable publicity, sufficient money was raised from anonymous donors to send "several hundred boys and a goodly number of families" to the West. On the basis of the interest thus aroused, the *Tribune* in 1882 took over the Fresh Air Fund which the *Evening Post* had inaugurated a short time previously. It has remained a flourishing institution ever since, providing thousands of underprivileged children with an annual respite from the heat and dirt of their slum environment. It is undoubtedly one of the most helpful, as it is the oldest, of the benevolences sponsored by the press, and has always been

conducted efficiently and in good taste.

For all its modest concessions to the new tone, the *Tribune* failed to profit to any marked extent. By 1898, the figures in Ayer's *Newspaper Annual* indicate that the daily circulation of the paper was 76,000; that of the Sunday edition, 84,000; of the Weekly 160,000. The same publication credited the paper in 1890 with 80,000 daily, 85,000 Sunday and 120,000 weekly readers, so that the Mauve Decade was rather blue for the *Tribune's* managers, especially when it is considered that, even before the terrific lift in circulation produced by the war, the *World* sold 370,000 copies every day and 500,000 on Sundays, and that energetic stripling the *Journal* had attained a circulation of 309,427 on weekdays and 425,000 on Sundays. A recent editorial in *Editor and Publisher* stated that:

For all its saffron faults, sensationalism yielded "mass circulation" as a fixed newspaper asset.¹⁶

The *Tribune* was not sensational, and so did not share in this valuable asset.

Nevertheless, it was a profitable institution throughout the 'nineties. Dividends were resumed early in the 'eighties and continued until the end of the next decade. The financial stake of the Reid family in the paper increased steadily. In October, 1883, Whitelaw Reid owned 75 of the 200 shares; his wife had 48 and her father 20—143 in all. Of the shares outstanding, William E. Bond owned 13 and the Estate of J. C. Ayer 14. The rest were held in lots of 3 or less. It would seem that, when the capitalization was increased in 1878, the majority of the stockholders failed to exercise their option of buying the new shares, and these were all taken up by the Reids. It should be mentioned that Jay Gould's name does not appear on the list of stockholders at this time, his shares having been purchased two years previously by Mr. Mills.¹⁷

The reason for the *Tribune's* continued prosperity under the handicap of a relatively falling circulation probably lies chiefly in the fact that it was a class publication, with a clientèle that interested advertisers. The daily edition was the paper of the class to which Reid now belonged. It advocated the political ideas to which they subscribed and catered to their tastes. Its language

never offended their susceptibilities, nor was there that exploitation of Society gossip which Pulitzer fostered for the ostensible purpose of discrediting "aristocracy." It was the paper which appeared most prominently in the racks of the Fifth Avenue clubs and followed its readers to Newport and Tuxedo Park. Hence an expensive and lucrative type of advertising fell to its share.

The position of the Weekly was somewhat different. In the conservative Eastern rural sections, the Weekly had the tenacity of long tradition, and it held its ground to the end of the nineteenth century against the ever-increasing local dailies. Thus it provided a good medium for the limited number of national advertisers then existing—of farm machinery, patent medicine and the like. As an advertisement of the Weekly in 1890 proudly said, "the value of this great paper of the Farmers, Country Merchants and Union Veterans of the country is almost too well known to need explanation."

This type of circulation and advertising could be retained far more easily than that of the more volatile masses which capriciously read or ignored the *Sun*, for instance; but there was a slow drain which gradually cut into the *Tribune's* profits.

The stable quality of the *Tribune's* circulation enabled the paper to maintain a 3¢ price on its daily until October 21, 1909, despite the fact that Hearst had begun his meteoric career in 1895 with the *Journal* selling at 1¢, and was followed, on February 10, 1896, by the *World*. This price advantage brought in a goodly sum in circulation income, and the *Tribune's* economical management contributed to the immediate profits.

For sensationalism demands large expenditure. The wages on the *Tribune* were low, if tolerably secure, and there was a much smaller outlay for features, as well as for equipment. The paper's presses were kept in good order, and frequently renewed, however. In October, 1896, a new quadruple press was installed to meet the demands of the Weekly during the campaign. It must be remembered that the *Tribune* was, as Chauncey M. Depew said, the "greatest organ of its party," and at election time provided the Republicans with their best campaign material. At such times the circulation really rose to impressive heights, and probably helped tide over the slack periods. For instance, in the campaign

of 1896, the Weekly claimed a circulation which touched 242,650.

For these reasons, the *Tribune* during the 'nineties more than paid its way. And its influence was greater than the relative fall in circulation indicated.

CHAPTER XII

BRYAN—AND TOM PLATT

If the last decade of the nineteenth century was a period of something very like stagnation in the *Tribune*, considered journalistically, the editorial page proved that even under the handicap of Reid's absence it retained most of its old strength. The politics of the 'nineties were favorable to forthright expression. Great movements of thought reasserted themselves as a comparatively contented period of prosperity faded into harsh depression. Economic and constitutional theories were put on the defensive. A system of government developed in New York State which was inimical to its best interests, and had to be combated. Finally, the country was swept into the swift tide of international politics; the momentous question arose as to whether its true course lay in the dangerous midstream, or the placid and unenterprising shallows. The days when the disposition of petty offices was the chief theme of politics were over for the time, and the *Tribune* arose to its new opportunities.

The decade opened with the Harrison Administration in full tide of achievement. Times were still good; two major problems presented themselves—silver and the surplus. The first was not the great panacea it later became, but the West was discontented with the results of the Bland-Allison Act. Silver prices were still slipping; the Republican platform of 1888 had spoken against the demonetization of the white metal, and praised the bimetallic standard. With the country in a prosperous condition even conservatives felt, indulgently, that something might be done for silver.

The *Tribune* apparently shared this viewpoint at first. It gave respectful hearing in its columns to such silver advocates as Senator William M. Stewart of Nevada, urging the "thoughtful consideration of the public." When the House presented the Sherman Silver Purchase bill in its first form, increasing the amount

of silver purchased by the Treasury, the *Tribune* said it was to some extent disappointing, like every true compromise, particularly in the clause providing for the redemption of silver certificates. However, "the problem of practical statesmanship," added the paper, "is to get as nearly the best thing as possible without failing to get something good."

But the *Tribune's* tolerance of the silver agitation was to receive a severe jolt. The Senate introduced a bill providing for the unlimited coinage of silver, which would have expanded the currency hugely. Instantly the paper responded. The Senate's action was not only "superlative folly," but of an "essentially immoral and wrongful character." The *Tribune* preached on inflation, with "Thou Shalt Not Steal" as the text. After this episode of June, 1890, the *Tribune* was exceedingly dubious of every movement on the part of the silver men.

The bill in its final form, however, was accepted by the paper, in the interests of party harmony. Though it committed the government to purchase 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month, the certificates issued against the metal were payable either in gold or silver at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, which seemed somewhat reassuring. Finally, the *Tribune* confidently asserted that "as a rule financial bills which are passed by Republican votes alone do not turn out badly."

The second major problem of Congress in 1890 was the surplus. Republicans assumed that the victory of Harrison gave them a mandate to reject any downward revision of the tariff. Indeed, with a rather brash courage, in face of Cleveland's popular majority in 1888, they proceeded to raise it. The bill introduced by William McKinley of Ohio materially increased the duties in several schedules, providing the first major change in the tariff since the Civil War. The *Tribune* commented:

It is gratifying to find at last a Congress which has the intelligence to see that a protective tariff does not answer the just expectations of the people unless it protects, and the courage to raise duties on particular classes of goods when experience has shown that in the long progress of reduction the duties have been put too low.

But the tariff solution having been thus rejected, the surplus still remained, and Congress was put to the simple expedient of

spending it. All manner of appropriations were made—the usual “pork-barrel” was distended, large grants made to the navy, and expensive additions to the pension list authorized. The *Tribune* was a bit alarmed at the spending fury of the legislature. In pension matters it was disposed to be generous. If the Disability Pension Law opened loopholes to fraud, the paper said, “that is infinitely less important for a rich and grateful people than the certainty that those who really need aid shall receive it.” But the cumulative effect was somewhat staggering. On June 14, 1890, the *Tribune* uttered an admonition:

It is too early to count up the appropriations by this Congress, but it is not too early to repeat the warning that lavish expenditures this year may result in beggarly majorities or no majorities at all. . . .

With provision for the necessary expenditures of the Government and other appropriations already made, Congress cannot help exceeding the appropriations of the last and worst Democratic Congress if it goes on adding liberally and loosely for rivers and harbors, public buildings and other objects in which individual members feel an interest.

It was even so. The Fifty-First Congress had earned the then glittering title of the Billion Dollar Congress, but it had made poor provision against the wrath to come. The McKinley Bill became law, October 1, 1890—and the cost of living rose materially and immediately. Whether this was the inevitable result of the new schedules or was due to profit-seeking storekeepers with a new excuse, the public resented it, and in the November elections the Republicans were badly beaten and lost control of the House.

The auguries for the Presidential year to come were not promising. Through 1891, Reid, in Paris, received pessimistic reports of the outlook, which, especially in New York State, was bad. On December 1, 1891, he wrote to President Harrison, submitting his resignation on the ground that private affairs required his attention. In accepting, the President alluded to the need for the Minister’s “counsel and help” at home.¹ John Hay rejoiced at the news, for he felt that Harrison had only a “fighting chance” of reelection.² The Republicans were in a pickle.

The New York State organization, apart from sharing the onus of the McKinley Bill with the national party, was again plagued

with a factional dispute, due to the rising power of Thomas Collier Platt. This worthy gentleman had been believed decently interred by the events of 1881. He had stood aloof during the vengeful assault of Arthur and Conkling upon Cornell, and was quite generally referred to as "the defunct Mr. Platt." But the report of his demise, like that of Mark Twain, was greatly exaggerated. With unassuming patience he first placed himself at the command of Warner Miller, Conkling's able and honest successor in the Senate, and built up his local machine. In 1885, he tried conclusions with Miller in a vain attempt to place Levi P. Morton in the Senate. Two years later, Platt was able to defeat Miller's try for reelection, and by 1888 he had a strong delegation at his orders in the National Convention.

Platt believed, or affected to believe, that Harrison had promised him a Cabinet post for his services in that campaign,³ and his power was now sufficient to make his good will important. It had been built up in the "twilight of Republican politics" in New York State, from 1884 to 1888, while David Bennett Hill's Democratic machine held the state patronage, Cleveland, the nation and Tammany, the city. Platt's patient service in the lean years received the reward of a large slice of Federal patronage under Harrison—and many were in his debt.

Whitelaw Reid, because of his absence during the period that Platt brooded over his loss of a Cabinet position, was felt to be in a good position to compose the dispute. He presided diplomatically over the convention which selected delegates to the National body, and no doubt his nomination as Harrison's running mate was believed a move which would antagonize neither Platt nor the Harrison men in New York. But Platt could not forget the *Tribune's* Half-Breed stand so readily. His recollection of the National Convention of 1892 was graphically, if not authentically, expressed in his so-called *Autobiography* many years later:

Harrison's nomination caused a chattering of the teeth among the warm-blooded Republicans of the East. When there was added to it the choice of Whitelaw Reid, a persistent assailant of the New York organization, many of the New York delegates, including myself, wrapped ourselves in overcoats and ear-muffs, hurried from the convention hall and took the first train to New York.⁴

This description of his emotions may have been colored by later events, for Platt submitted to a surface reconciliation arranged at Ophir Hall between the New York boss and the candidates of his party. But the suspicion ran after the election that Platt "knifed" the ticket in his state.

The recalcitrance of Tom Platt added to difficulties already threatening the Republicans. Grover Cleveland was nominated by their opponents, and the suspected discontent of Tammany at that choice was balanced by the coldness of Platt toward his own titular party head. The extravagance of the Fifty-First Congress, the premonitory rumblings of hard times as indicated by the steel strike which broke out while the campaign was in progress, and above all, the McKinley Tariff, operated against Harrison and Reid.

The campaign was unwontedly courteous and gentlemanly, particularly in the *Tribune*. Speaking of the nomination of its editor, the paper said:

On this point it becomes the *Tribune* to speak briefly and simply. The distinction was not sought, and cannot induce a more zealous and loyal support of the Republican ticket by the *Tribune* than it would have given to any candidate whom the convention could have chosen. The nomination of Mr. Reid does, however, impose upon this journal special obligation to courtesy and fairness and patriotism which it will endeavor so to discharge as to deserve the approbation of friends and the respect of opponents.

The paper's course as a whole met the requirements of its peculiar situation. It argued the merits of the McKinley Tariff fervently but impersonally. The wage cuts leading to the Homestead Strike it dismissed as one of the "ripples on the rising tide" of protected prosperity. When referring to Cleveland, the paper was generally respectful. It poked fun at the Ex-President's pompous vocabulary and the awe it excited among his followers; had the famous phrase "innocuous desuetude" been a few syllables longer, one quip ran, "it would no doubt have been set to music and played on barrel-organs." In a more serious vein, the *Tribune* doubted that Cleveland really represented his party. In part this was undoubtedly true—Cleveland's position on silver was soon to be rejected by the Western and Southern Democrats; his

stand on the tariff was also to be stultified by local interests in his ranks. As for the *Tribune's* contention that in integrity the Democratic candidate was on a higher plane than the party as a whole, that may be dismissed as a left-handed campaign compliment. It was on this basis, however, that the *Tribune* concluded that "Grover Cleveland's nomination is a fraud—or else he is."

As Republican skies grew darker, *Tribune* readers went to the polls with this ominous warning before them:

The day has come which will determine whether the solid and superb prosperity of the United States shall be preserved and enhanced through many years or disaster and unhappiness overshadow the land.

Cleveland was returned by the electorate, and, as the *Tribune* predicted, "disaster and unhappiness" overshadowed the land. The Democrats were but little to blame in this, although uncertainty over the tariff played a part in the fears of business men. The depression of '93 was world-wide, and, in addition, this country was plagued by a dwindling gold supply as silver flooded in. The price of silver continued its fall, and money went into hiding. An acute currency shortage developed as this curious advertisement by a well-known private bank reveals:

Wanted

Gold, Silver or Paper Money

We will purchase at a liberal certified premium in exchange for our checks payable through the Clearing House, Gold coin, Standard Silver Dollars, United States Notes, Certificates and National Bank Notes and checks on the Assistant Treasurer in New York.

This situation—the threat of a decline to a silver standard coupled with a real currency shortage—led to two types of opposed agitation. The East demanded a repeal of the Sherman Act to stop the outflow of gold and preserve the nation's standing in international trade, while the debtor West opposed any contraction of an already tight currency, and clamored for further inflation. Incendiary speeches came from the Silver States. Governor Waite of Colorado shouted that he would ride in blood to his horse's bridles rather than see the crime of '73 repeated, and all over the West "red-mouthed and red-headed" orators aroused the

mirth and alarm of the conservative sections.

Mr. Cleveland summoned an extra session of Congress and demanded the repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act. The *Tribune* applauded his courage:

The President deserves high honor for this message, so free from every suggestion of trimming and compromise at a time when the air is full of bartering schemes and so earnest and strong in its appeal to the good sense of men of all parties to stop the dread of vicious action on the money question.

Congress repealed the Sherman Act on October 30, 1893, and the *Tribune* suggested that the President further reassure the business interests of the country by a promise to leave the tariff untouched. But Cleveland had no intention of throwing his most cherished plank over thus summarily. In the first regular session of his Administration a bill was presented to lower the duties imposed by the McKinley Act. The *Tribune*, in great disgust, urged the Democrats to get through the work speedily:

The cost will indeed be great. But if reasoning and honorable appeals will not avert it, the cost had better be faced now, so that the people may quickly be so educated by experience as never again to vote freakishly, foolishly and blindly for the party which menaces their industrial freedom and the happiness of their homes.

The Democrats, however, were speedily enmeshed in that web of local interests which is woven into every tariff dispute, and the Wilson Tariff Bill was long delayed in passage. One provision came in for especial condemnation in the *Tribune*, the levy of a tax on income. This feature of the measure, said the paper, was the pet of all the "fanatical property-haters in Congress" and "an attempt to buy the votes of the basest and least worthy elements of society by trampling upon all equality of rights and by plundering those who have anything to lose." This income-tax law was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court soon after its passage.

In general, the bill, even as first presented, proved surprisingly conservative, as do most attempts to reduce duties. As the *New York Journal of Commerce* remarked,

The spectacle of an industrial revolution which has created such an incontinent scare all over the country is thereby dispelled. Those who had hoped for a fundamentally non-protective tariff find a tariff still more highly protective than that of any other country.

But in the Senate even this moderate measure was brought considerably closer to its Republican predecessor. The principle of free raw materials, embodied in the House bill, was thrown over almost completely, and in one particular instance, in a shameful fashion. As a patent gift to Louisiana Democrats, a duty was placed upon sugar. The *Tribune* enjoyed the spectacle of Democrats hacking their own plank to bits and made the most of it. The sugar business, said the paper, was the "most shamefully corrupt act of which either House has ever been guilty." When Cleveland, resentful of the stultification of party pledges implied in the Senate Bill, wrote a scorching letter denouncing the act, the *Tribune* inquired, rather pertinently, why the President had not threatened a veto, if the act were so bad? The Wilson Tariff was called the "Bill of Sale" in the *Tribune's* columns, and when Cleveland disgustedly permitted it to become law without his signature, headlines announced that "Cleveland Acts The Coward," while the editorial comment proved that the Greeley fire was not yet dead in the paper he had founded:

And the President knew how vile and bad the measure was, shouted out its shame to the whole country when he imagined that some frivolous change would give him a shallow seeming of personal success, and in the end was too silly to sign and too thoroughly whipped to veto.

While the discussion of the tariff dragged on, the depression settled with ever greater weight on the country, and the demands of the farmer and the laborer for relief grew more insistent. Straggling "armies" formed in the West to march to Washington and petition for inflation. Strikes broke out, and in June of 1894, the industrial warfare suddenly became acute. The workers of the Pullman Company, exasperated by a 25% reduction in wages (following hard on the declaration of a dividend by the directors), struck, and were supported by the American Railway Union headed by Eugene V. Debs.⁵ The Union refused to handle trains carrying Pullman cars, and by June 30, traffic, in and out of

Chicago, the center of agitation, was practically at a standstill. The *Tribune* attributed the strike to the "industry-smashing" of Cleveland's administration, and demanded stern measures. Violence broke out in the Chicago yards, and the paper asserted that "Martial Law, backed by a half-million men if necessary, ought to be instantly and infinitely preferable to rapidly growing anarchy!"

Cleveland took instant action. Despite the protests of Governor John P. Altgeld of Illinois, who, by freeing two of the men convicted after the Haymarket riots of 1886, had won the title of the "Anarchist Governor," Cleveland sent Federal troops into Chicago, on the grounds that the movement of the United States Mails had been interfered with. The *Tribune*, in common with most of the press, approved this step highly. The *World* at first condemned Federal interference, but as soon as Joseph Pulitzer heard of it, the paper changed its tune.⁶ The *Tribune*, while commending Cleveland's courageous action, did not fail to point to the Democrat tariff policy as the root cause of the trouble, and further charged that Cleveland's "own appeals to a disorderly and lawless spirit during the campaign of 1892 . . . fostered antagonism between rich and poor, between employers and employed."

Industrial strife and agricultural discontent were combining to form the great crusade of 1896. The *Tribune* used its influence to the utmost to preserve the ways of economic life which its editor professed, but underneath the graver struggle of '94 ran a political battle which is perhaps more pertinent to the *Tribune's* individual history. This was the beginning of the Ten Years' War between Whitelaw Reid and Thomas Collier Platt, which endured while Platt's power lasted, with distinct effect both on Reid's political fortunes and the relations of his paper to the Republican Party.

Reid was not, as has been shown, an enemy of political machines as such, though he generally opposed the abuses resulting therefrom. Nor was he at the outset a foe of Platt. The immediate cause of the breach was rather a quarrel between partners, but it ultimately drew the *Tribune* into a fight with a pernicious element in political life.

The weak point in the Republican organization of New York

State has always been New York City. Except for brief intervals the metropolis has been securely Democratic, and Republican workers there depend for their rewards upon state or national patronage. As the source of this patronage, Platt held the city organization in a tight grip, but the feeling was strong that he failed to use his power to the party's best advantage. Whether by agreement with Tammany, or because he felt any exertions against the Hall wasted energy, Platt was content to let the city machine fall into slipshod ways, unable to give the Democrats a good fight, or to capitalize on their errors.

This condition was well illustrated by the election of 1893. The inevitable depression reaction against the party in power at Washington was intensified by the Democratic nomination of Isaac H. Maynard for Justice of the Court of Appeals. Maynard was accused of materially assisting his party to "steal" a State Senator, by purloining an election return while Counsel for the Board of Canvassers. In addition to the burden of this "crime-tainted" candidate, the Democrats were weighed down by increasing discontent at the control of Tammany in New York City, and a reform movement in Brooklyn, directed at John Y. McKane, the "Czar of Coney Island." The latter worthy occasioned a storm of criticism which reacted against his party. A group of accountants with a court order went to Coney Island to examine the registration lists, and McKane blandly had them arrested as vagrants, and jailed by a complaisant magistrate. The joint effect of these influences was a surprising victory for the Republicans, for which few were inclined to give any credit to Tom Platt. As he himself later admitted, "Divine Providence did it." ⁷ The demand for reform of the organization, especially in New York City, became insistent.

To meet it, the New York County Committee appointed a Committee of Thirty to present a plan for reorganization. This group, headed by George Bliss, was composed of the "heavy respectables" of the party, men of substance and dignity. But they were not active in local politics, and it seemed rather inconsistent that the County Committee should judge and correct its own errors. John Milholland, acting on behalf of Whitelaw Reid, began to form a new organization of younger men to supplant the old

committee entirely.

At first Platt openly favored the Milholland movement, whose members were known as "anti-Machine Republicans." A subcommittee of the State Committee, entirely subservient to the Boss, was appointed to judge the claims of Milholland and Bliss, and the *Tribune* was confident that its own project would be favored. But to its vast surprise, the "heavy respectables" won in committee, and later in the State convention. Platt had reversed himself.

His own explanation years later is hardly worth consideration. He contended in his *Autobiography* that Reid, "brandishing his fist," had threatened him with the power of the *Tribune* if the Milholland party was not sustained.⁸ This is grotesquely out of character. The *Tribune's* surmise was more plausible; that Platt had favored the anti-Machine men in order to discredit them by his association, meanwhile packing the Bliss Committee with his own adherents. Probably the truth of the matter is, as R. C. E. Brown suggests, that Platt feared the influence of Reid in the Milholland movement.⁹

Whatever the cause, there was open war. Through his henchmen on the bipartisan Police Board, Platt took the police advertising away from the *Tribune*, and then publicly accused the paper of attacking him on that account—which is certainly an inverted version of the matter. The advertising went to one of Platt's supporters, the *Press*.

The *Tribune* carried on its war with zeal and the skill born of intimate knowledge of the ways of politics. It ridiculed the Boss, exposed his trick of sending out prepared "interviews" to the press, attacked his nominees and all his political moves. The news articles and editorials of the *Tribune* between 1894 and 1900 provide a perfect treasury of material on the boss system in American politics. As the "foremost organ of its party," read by party workers everywhere, it checked Platt's influence in national affairs. Platt cared little for the opinion of the metropolitan press, as long as he could, with advertising and office, control the country weeklies. But in this field as well, he encountered the *Tribune*, for the Weekly had a wide circulation upstate. Such pungent sum-

maries of the methods of his rule as the following found their way into the very citadels of Platt's power:

The crying evil of Mr. Platt's political autocracy was that as party Boss, the dictator of its nominations and most potential influence in its legislation, he extorted money from the great corporations as contributions to campaign funds, the consideration for which was votes in the Legislature for or against legislation affecting those corporations. . . . When Mr. Platt received the subscription of a corporation to his campaign funds both he and the Senators and Assemblymen to whose campaign expenses these contributions went by Mr. Platt's personal check were to hold themselves under obligations to the donors whenever in the Legislature the latter had any interest at stake.

Platt's answer to the onslaught of the *Tribune* was to undermine in every possible way the political credit of its editor with the national organization, while operating in a more devious fashion against the paper itself. In addition to the *Press*, owned by some of his friends, Platt had the eccentric support of the *Sun* after 1894. Previously that paper had been an ally of Tammany, but, as the *Tribune* said, Platt "found the *Sun* wandering homeless after Tammany's defeat in 1894 and tied a string to it." Dana, in his last years, resumed his feud against Reid, and Platt, resorting to the tactics of 1872, sent the *Sun* to *Tribune* subscribers.

On the whole, victory lay with Platt. He steadily consolidated his power. In 1894, he elected Levi P. Morton Governor of the State—the first Republican to hold that office since 1882. In the same year a constitutional provision was ratified, providing that no one county might have more than one-third of the state Senators, and no two counties, contiguous or separated only by "public waters," might have more than one-half. This confined Tammany's influence in the state legislature straitly. Platt held Morton under his thumb by promising to wield his influence for the Governor in the National Convention, and Morton was nervously anxious to secure this support. As the great Presidential year of 1896 opened, the "Easy Boss" was in high feather, as this news dispatch in the *Tribune* reveals:

"Platt is on top at last," said one of his most intimate advisers at Albany on New Year's day. He controls the entire state government. The Senate is his, and he owns the Assembly. No speaker was ever more obedient than Fish. All the members of Congress are his henchmen. The State Committee knows no law but his will. He is the Committee. He will name the next United States Senator. He will control the seventy-two delegates from this state to the National Convention, and no power on earth can prevent him from selecting the next President of the United States.

The *Tribune*, therefore, went into the momentous campaign of '96 with two great desires—first to secure the election of a Republican; second, to check the high-vaulting ambition of Tom Platt.

A Republican victory seemed of vital moment to the propertied class which the *Tribune* so largely represented. Cleveland had proved to be, as the paper predicted, unrepresentative of his party, and it was clear that the radical inflationists would reject his leadership. The one great issue was clearly seen to be Silver, and the *Tribune*, along with most of the East, felt it of the first importance to check inflation sentiment in Republican ranks and win with the Gold Standard.

The candidate who showed the most promise in the pre-convention campaign was Major William McKinley of Ohio. In the convention of 1892 he had received a complimentary vote for President, and the *Tribune* remarked that his reward would come later. He had succeeded Blaine as the foremost exponent of protection in politics, and had a quiet charm and warmth of manner which attracted adherents. What was more to the point, he had an "angel" in Marcus Alonzo Hanna, wealthy and politically shrewd, a master of the art of financial campaign management and of large scale propaganda. McKinley's position was strong, and he early had the unobtrusive support of the *Tribune*, but his attitude on currency was not particularly clear. He had voted for the Bland-Allison Act and the Sherman Act; and the Ohio State convention of 1896, which was dominated in McKinley's interest, produced a money plank which could be, and was, interpreted to mean almost anything.

Under these circumstances, it was necessary to reassure gold supporters of this prospective candidate's soundness on the ques-

tion, and also to endeavor to commit him more definitely. Reid and the *Tribune* took an active part in both directions. In the middle of May, Reid telegraphed an editorial to his paper interpreting McKinley's record as in favor of sound money.¹⁰ On June 1, the editor gave a personal interview to the press, predicting the nomination of McKinley on a "thorough-going honest-money platform, solid as a cube." Meanwhile, in conference and by letter Reid stressed the importance of the currency.

The financiers of the East wanted the word "gold" prominently displayed. Pierpont Morgan suggested a statement in favor of "the existing gold standard"—which was the phrase eventually employed—and Reid forwarded the idea to McKinley.¹¹ The *Tribune* preferred not to antagonize needlessly those who had a horror of gold, and to limit the wording of the plank to "the existing standard." An editorial on June 16 explained this stand:

There is no necessity to maintain that the words "gold standard" must of necessity be used, because the present standard is that, and everybody knows it. There is not the least occasion to insist in form of words that silver monometalism would debase the currency, because everybody knows that also. But the Republican party ought to declare that the money in which wages of labor are paid shall not in any way be debased or lowered in purchasing power; that the pledges to pay money as good as the best that is known to the commercial world shall be sacredly observed, and that the Republican party is not going to run any risk of demonetizing gold, and therefore will not consent to the free coinage of silver, unless there can first be secured such international agreement as will fix the ratio between silver and gold, beyond risk of failure, in all the great commercial countries.

The Republican National Convention preferred the bolder way, and McKinley was nominated on a platform which promised to sustain the existing gold standard. The *Tribune* naturally rejoiced at the convention's choice, the more so because the paper felt that it indicated that bosses were "played out." Platt went to the convention apparently intent upon redeeming his promise to Governor Morton. Reid had ordered his paper to treat Morton's candidacy as a plot to hold the New York delegation in line long enough to make a trade, and when Platt returned without having named Morton, and without receiving the poor boon of naming the Vice-President, the paper compared him to Tartarin, return-

ing without any lions.

The Republicans completed their ticket on June 16. In the second week in July "that National boil called Democracy, which has been festering for so many years" came, in the *Tribune's* unlovely metaphor, to a head at Chicago. The silver advocates captured the convention, nominated William Jennings Bryan in a storm of wild enthusiasm, and adopted a platform which sent a chill over the conservative sections of the country. It demanded the immediate free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of sixteen to one (the weight of each silver dollar to be sixteen times that of the standard gold dollar), threatened to reconstitute the Supreme Court in order to permit an income tax, demanded arbitration in labor disputes, and attacked the action of the Administration in the Chicago strike. The McKinley Tariff was assailed, as well as the national bank-note system and Cleveland's bond issues.

The reaction of the Eastern press to the Chicago platform and candidate was immediate and violent. Every Democratic paper in New York City except the *Journal* and the *Recorder* bolted the ticket. The *Tribune's* denunciation was fierce:

The rebellion against civilization and honesty which the Democratic party undertakes would be more destructive and more bloody than the Civil War itself, if the Anarchist demands of Chicago were pushed to their natural result, but the world knows they will not be. The Democratic party lends itself to the basest and most dangerous ends, only because it has been beaten out of all hope of continued existence except as an agent of the enemies of honesty, prosperity and social order.

The excitement of the country was great throughout all this campaign. While Bryan was in the Senate, the *Tribune* in a playful mood, referred to him as a "sirocco." "He has gifts of speech that can sway large audiences, paralyze industry, arrest growing crops and break up families." Now the jest seemed turned to earnest. Storekeepers, fearing unmeasured inflation, withdrew money from the bank and invested it in commodities. The Democratic *World* felt that to question McKinley's election "is to doubt the intelligence, the underlying honesty and the public morality of the people." But as cheering crowds responded to Bryan's "silver-

tongued" oratory, the intelligence, etc., of the people was open to question.

The *Tribune* expressed conservative alarm in its most fevered state, its editorials becoming classic examples of the state of the public mind. The Democratic platform was "that abominable screed"; Bryan, the "Jacobin candidate," the "wretched addlepated boy"; while John P. Altgeld of Illinois, the "Anarchist Governor" and a prominent Bryan supporter, was described in a news article as "repellant," with a "furtive glance" and "gloomy stare" resembling Guiteau, Garfield's assassin. "A lean and hungry look suggests a conspirator of the Cassius type." The whole Democratic campaign was stigmatized as an attack on the Ten Commandments.

On election morning, the *Tribune's* impassioned leader bade the country

Vote! Vote! at once! Vote for McKinley and Hobart, for Black and Woodruff, for Republican Congressmen, for sound money and honest government, for the supremacy of the laws and the purity of the courts, for National prosperity and National honor, for equal laws and peace and brotherhood among men, for the Constitution and the Flag! Vote!

And when, next morning, the headlines, decorated with a waving flag, shouted of the "UPRISING OF A GREAT PEOPLE" and of "ANARCHY AND REPUDIATION TRAMPLED UNDER FOOT," the editorial page voiced a simple and fervid "Thank God!" Well might the *Nation* say:

Probably no man in civil life has succeeded in inspiring so much terror without taking life as Bryan.

With the verdict against Bryanism delivered, the business of the country again began its forward stride. In but a few days more than a year after the election of 1896, the *Tribune* stated proudly, "At no previous time has the course of trade seemed to favor this country so powerfully or to give it so great a control over the money markets of the world." Freed of internal struggles, the nation once more became conscious of its strength in the world. That restless feeling of impending destiny which had man-

ifested itself in the early 'eighties became more pronounced.

The course of the Cleveland Administration had alternately checked and encouraged this mood. In 1893, Harrison had submitted a treaty for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, but too late to be acted upon before his successor took office. Cleveland withdrew the treaty, inquired into the government which tendered the offer, and came to the conclusion that United States officers had aided a revolution in a friendly state for the purpose of acquiring the Islands. He refused to resubmit the treaty and even considered replacing Queen Liliuokalani on the throne from which the revolution had ejected her.

The *Tribune* condemned this "conspiracy against civilization in the Pacific Islands" in no measured terms. Secretary of State Walter Q. Gresham was characterized as "the smallest man who has ever been at the head of the State Department and he is resentful and vindictive." The President "though a larger man in every way, . . . is self-willed, obstinate and narrow-minded in all questions of American diplomacy." So long as Hawaii "holds its place in the Pacific Ocean, its interests and those of the United States must be made coincidental." Later in his term Cleveland gave the people of the United States a chance to air their patriotism in his Venezuela message, and when England submitted to arbitration under what was practically a threat of war, national pride knew no bounds. By 1897 the *Tribune* was tolerantly rebuking the more strenuous boasts of those who threatened to "lick all creation." America was feeling its muscles.

Meanwhile, in February, 1895, revolution broke out in Cuba, an American ship was fired on by a Spanish war vessel, and the martial spirit had found a focus. The *Tribune* was alert to protest any encroachment upon American rights, it sympathized with the Cubans in their attempt to gain independence, and deplored Spanish violence.

If Spain cannot subjugate Cuba by ordinary means she would better give up the attempt and retire from the island altogether. We want no blood-hound work in this last decade of the nineteenth century.

But Spain did not retire, and conditions in the Ever-Faithful Isle became steadily worse. American sympathy with the op-

pressed mingled inextricably with jingoism to demand that Spain be driven from the island, that it be brought under our own beneficent sway. The *Tribune* became alarmed—it wanted Cuba, but not a war. When McKinley came into office Reid wrote him a note of prophecy: “Some day we will have Cuba, as well as the Sandwich Islands. To that extent I believe in Manifest Destiny.”¹² A curious reminiscence of Greeley’s letter during the San Domingo affair!

The viewpoint of the editor was more explicitly stated in the *Tribune* of February 6, 1898:

It is probable that Cuba will one day be annexed. There is no disguising that fact. . . . The United States does not mean to grab Cuba. . . . If ever Spain wishes to transfer the island to the United States, the United States will consider the proposition.

But the United States was impatient of destiny. Through the last days of Cleveland’s Administration the national temper became more sharply bellicose, more frankly acquisitive. The *World* and the *Journal* were in full career in a mad race for circulation, and they exploited American sympathy for the Cubans to the fullest. Joseph Pulitzer “once confessed that he had rather liked the idea of a war—not a big war—but one which would arouse interest and give him a chance to gauge the reflex in his circulation figures.”¹³ As for William Randolph Hearst, his rival, there is a story which, though probably apocryphal, really expresses his general attitude. He sent Frederick Remington, the artist, to Cuba before the sinking of the *Maine* to sketch the revolution and the coming war. Remington soon wired to New York:

Everything is quiet. There is no trouble here. There will be no war. I wish to return. Remington.

The answer came:

Please remain. You furnish the pictures and I’ll furnish the war.
W. R. Hearst.¹⁴

The “yellow press” piled sensation on sensation. Glaring headlines, shrieking of Spanish atrocities, of American rights invaded, beat into the public consciousness. The sober papers tried in vain

to stem the tide. E. L. Godkin of the *Post* hated the vulgarity of the sensational press, the warlike frame of mind and the itch for possessions which it aroused. He lashed out with savage pen—"A yellow journal office is perhaps the nearest approach, in atmosphere, to hell existing in any Christian state." But the *Post's* readers were few, while every scarehead sent the circulation of the *World* and *Journal* higher.

Cleveland had refused to concede anything to the "jingos," and, for a time, McKinley resisted their pressure. "McKinley and the Wall Street Cabinet are ready to surrender every particle of national honor and dignity," accused the *Journal*. The *Tribune* stoutly opposed all attempts to provoke hostilities. It asserted its belief that there were no valid grounds for war, condemned the exploitation of the Spanish Ambassador's indiscreet letter, sneered at "those newspapers which have consented in the most self-sacrificing way to become the custodians of the National honor," and even after the sinking of the *Maine* called for coolness, a suspension of judgment and faith in the President. But it faithfully followed the Administration into the eventual war, to the cry of "Remember the *Maine*!"

During the short struggle, the *Tribune* declined, in accordance with its established policy and economy, to enter into that expensive race for news which sent fleets of pressboats and armies of correspondents to Cuba. Its representatives in the field secured no "beats"; the episodes on which the paper prided itself were more in the nature of feature articles, such as the attempt of one correspondent, a Mr. Stegman, to rehabilitate the somewhat tarnished reputation of the Seventy-First Regiment of the New York National Guard. But the real *forte* of the *Tribune* was editorial discussion, and in preparing the country for the issues of the peace the paper was one of the leaders of the press.

As has been said, the *Tribune* was averse to war, but not to the fruits thereof, and it set about the task of educating the Americans in the rights and duties of colonial possessions. In the first place, the paper attacked the thesis that we had entered the war as partners of the rebels, to seek their aims. This country had fought to impose peace and protect American interests, and the disposition of Spanish territories was a matter between that na-

tion and ourselves. In respect to Cuba we were bound, unwisely, the *Tribune* thought, to abandon the island by reason of the Teller Resolution. The paper hoped and believed that the Cubans would of their own motion submit to annexation. When this proved illusory, the *Tribune* in 1900 advocated a speedy withdrawal from the island, so that the resulting anarchy might make permanent occupation by the United States a necessity.

In respect to the rest of the Spanish islands, we were bound by no such considerations, while the same reasons for the withdrawal of Spanish sovereignty applied as in Cuba, namely misgovernment and native discontent. On May 5, hard upon the news of Dewey's victory at Manila Bay, the *Tribune* discussed our duties in the Philippines:

It is to be observed that the United States Government has, so far as its own utterances are concerned, an entirely free hand in the matter. It has neither proclaimed nor disclaimed any intentions concerning these islands. . . . Yet in one respect the United States has not a free hand in the Philippines. A grave and imperative obligation has already been imposed upon us. We have stricken down Spanish sovereignty and set up our own. All that hereafter remains of Spanish rule in the islands will be under sufferance of the United States. That is a momentous fact. We cannot turn Spain out and leave the islands to their own devices. We cannot abolish the only government the islands have and leave them without any. That would be barbarous. This country will be bound, in honor and in morals, either itself to assume the administration of the islands or to empower some other competent authority to do so.

The paper adduced numerous reasons in addition to the moral obligation to seize the Philippines. Trade with China was growing; the Philippines were "the last westward stepping stones to the open doors of Chinese trade." To consolidate our position in the East, an Isthmian canal should be cut, Hawaii held, and "perhaps" Manila developed into "an American Hong Kong"—with Samoa and the Mariannas, America would then possess a chain of coaling stations across the Pacific. Finally, Spain owed us an indemnity, and the Philippines would be a good consideration.

Let us be prodigal to generosity in relieving Spain from any money payment. Let us never dream, as some have suggested, of playing Napoleon and exacting contributions of her art treasures in which are

wrapped her romantic history. Let us take nothing in wantonness. But let us yield nothing which we are bound for civilization's sake to hold. Generosity is a fine trait, but to do justice is an inalienable obligation.

It is plain that the *Tribune* had no confidence whatever in the ability of native populations to govern themselves. Many Americans did not share this belief, and more were impressed by the danger of admitting numerous alien populations to statehood. Whitelaw Reid and his paper were especially intent on combating this idea. The new possessions would not be considered as prospective States. The Constitution, said the paper, did not apply to organized Territories, which were subject to the will of Congress. Hawaii and the Spanish Islands should not even be organized Territories, but a "part of the territory of the United States" to be governed wholly and permanently by Congress—"mere possessions and not partners in proprietorship." As such they would constitute a bond of union for the continental States, since only property and not sovereign states could perform that function. And when it was objected that the ownership of such property, never destined to become an integral part of the American democracy, was an imperial and un-American idea, the *Tribune* responded:

The plea that every abuse must be protected because it is American is as old as the Nation, and every advance has from the beginning been denounced as un-American, and still will be, whether it is planned to secure seats for everybody in street cars or to do our duty as one of the powers of the world. But in spite of all dire forebodings the American people have uniformly shown that the American system was the one which seemed best adapted to meet the requirements of a particular situation, not what some old fogey told them was the method they had followed in other times.

This extensive body of doctrine had been built up by the *Tribune* between the declaration of war and the signing of the Peace Protocol on August 15. It remained the policy of the Republican Party, as later amplified by Hay and Roosevelt, so that the *Tribune* was one of the first organs of opinion to expound a detailed colonial system for the United States.

Reid's interest in the subject, indicated by the *Tribune's* editorials and by a summary review of the subject, in an essay under

his signature for the *Century Magazine*,¹⁵ was recognized by President McKinley. The editor was consulted on the terms of the protocol, by which Spain agreed to relinquish all claims to Cuba, to cede "Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies and also an island in the Ladrões, to be selected by the United States," and to remit to the definitive conference at Paris the question of the Philippines. Open recognition of the *Tribune's* viewpoint came with Reid's appointment as one of the Peace Commission and the eventual adoption by that body of substantially all of the *Tribune's* demands for territorial expansion.

But the signing of the treaty did not end the task of the paper. Ratification of the treaty by the Senate was secured only through the intervention of William Jennings Bryan, who hoped to save the issue for 1900. Many of those who had supported the war as an act of generosity to the Cubans were alarmed at the implications of possessing territory in the East. Joseph Pulitzer, after his great efforts to bring about the war, was for rejecting all conquests; and it became plain that a "campaign of education" would be necessary to persuade the people to give the Republican Administration a vote of confidence on the treaty.

The first opportunity given the *Tribune* to test the popularity of the policy it had advocated came in the New York State elections of 1898. Theodore Roosevelt, hero of the Santiago campaign and an avowed expansionist, was the Republican candidate, while the Democratic speakers early tended to make the acquisition of the Philippines an issue. The *Tribune* should have been able to give Roosevelt instant and hearty support. It had done so when he was a young Assemblyman; again, when as Police Commissioner in 1895-'96, Roosevelt aroused the hostility of the majority of the New York press by his stringent application of the regulations on saloons and gaming, the *Tribune* almost alone stood by him—this despite the fact that Roosevelt, taking the police advertising from the *Press* only gave it to the *Tribune* on a competitive bid, somewhat to Reid's annoyance.¹⁶ The paper recognized Roosevelt's essential integrity and his energy, but the situation was immensely complicated by the fact that Tom Platt stood as his sponsor.

Platt, despite his setback in 1896, was still allpowerful. Reid still desired the London Embassy—Platt stood in his way. McKinley first appointed John Hay to the post, then, in August, 1898, recalled him to take charge of the State Department and "suggested" to Platt that Reid be sent in his place. The "Easy Boss" replied with a masterpiece of invective. Reid was self-seeking, and not to be trusted, said this epistle. "The Republican failures of the last twenty years are to be laid at his door," since the state could only be carried for the Republicans by "close, election-district organization" which the *Tribune* had undermined by creating prejudice against the leaders and distrust of their motives and by misconstruing their acts. The *Tribune's* influence was "now at the very lowest ebb to which it has ever fallen," but Reid's appointment would revive its destructive power. Its "prejudicial and disintegrating course" had finally rendered the name of Whitelaw Reid so odious to Republicans, generally, that his advancement now would be regarded as "a personal insult to every loyal member of the party."¹⁷

This remarkable tribute to the power of the *Tribune*, as a force for better government in the state, effectually barred Reid's way to London. He was fobbed off with the Peace Commission, and the war with Platt was hopelessly embittered.

Frank S. Black had been elected Governor in 1896. He had shown a marked tendency to reject Platt's domination, and his generally creditable administration won the admiration of the *Tribune*. When the boss accepted Roosevelt as his candidate, it seemed to the *Tribune* a mean revenge on Black. The paper was perplexed. A straw vote showed unmistakably the Colonel's popularity, and pressure was brought upon Black to withdraw before the convention. The *Tribune* applauded his refusal:

Free and open contests in a convention are the best guarantees that proper candidates will be selected, and Governor Black will earn the lasting gratitude of good citizens for reviving the habit of making Republican nominations in conventions and not at Political headquarters.

Governor Black's supporters also raised the question of Roosevelt's eligibility, due to his residence out of the State, while Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The *Tribune's* solicitude over this is-

sue is a measure of its reluctance to support the avowed candidate of Thomas C. Platt. Nevertheless, when the boss's choice was ratified in convention, the *Tribune* accepted the verdict gracefully, drawing what comfort it could from Roosevelt's independence of mind.

The compelling power of personal character, of high ideals, has asserted itself, and its triumph is not less welcome and encouraging because accomplished through the mechanism of a reluctant organization.

After this somewhat hesitant start, the *Tribune* swung into the campaign with all its old enthusiasm. As a verdict on the terms of peace the canvass was disappointing. Roosevelt conducted a hurrah campaign, and the *Tribune* asked the voters "Will you vote to aid Spain?" But the Democrats attacked the Republican conduct of the war and the prospect of a colonial empire with great effect. The Republicans became alarmed, and it was probably only Richard Croker's brazen refusal to renominate a judge who had declined to grant him a favor that saved the situation. The slogan "For the Unsullied Ermine" elected Roosevelt, but it was not an altogether happy augury for 1900.

The Presidential year, the outset of a new century, put the issues of the war to the ultimate test of public approval. The pre-convention struggles were rather mild. McKinley was nominated without dispute, and the fireworks of the Republican Convention were provided by Platt's successful attempt to sidetrack the "Roosevelt Flyer" into the Vice-Presidency. The Rough Rider had largely justified the *Tribune's* eventual faith in his independence, and Platt was determined he should not serve another term as Governor. Bryan again won the Democratic nomination, and while a despairing declaration for free silver was included in the platform, the party tried to concentrate its fire on the mistakes of the Republican administration of the War Department, and upon imperialism.

The Republicans were reluctant to accept the challenge. The Filipinos had not taken kindly to their protectors, and a bitter little war was dragging on in the islands. The *Tribune* reasserted its doctrines of the duties and advantages of our colonial possessions. It printed a front-page cartoon showing Progress standing

in the Philippines upholding an American flag, whose stripes carried the words Law, Order, Justice and Education. The flag bore a stain labeled "Surrender to the Murderers of the Defenders of Old Glory," while Bryan, with a nasty sneer and a handful of "Anti-Expansion" mud, stood ready to add another smudge to the emblem. But, while continuing its "campaign of education," the *Tribune* denied that Imperialism was the real issue. It claimed that the diverse elements of Bryanism—Populists, Democrats and Silver Republicans—could only unite on the formula of 16 to 1.

Everything else is and must be secondary from the nature of their union and all attempts by them to concentrate on other subjects is a mere essay in fraud.

The campaign, therefore, was conducted by the *Tribune* and its party chiefly in the spirit of '96, with the immeasurable advantage of a prosperous country to attest the value of the gold standard. The *Tribune's* reiteration of the charge that "Mr. Bryan is and has been preaching class hatred," (illustrated by a picture of "Bryanite Campaign Arguments," a stick, a turnip and an old shoe thrown at Roosevelt while on a speaking tour) fell upon ears which preferred the fruits of the gold policy in contrast to the blossom of social and economic reforms. The American people were satisfied with Republicanism, and elected McKinley.

With this result attained, however, the *Tribune* was quick to claim the victory for the Treaty of Paris as well as for gold. The Democrats had advanced the issue and "the strength of anti-imperialism in the country was put fairly to the test. The result is an overwhelming victory for imperialism, whatever that may mean."

So the twentieth century began, with the ideas of the *Tribune* victorious all along the line. The Republicans were securely in power, the tariff was higher than ever before, the gold standard secure and the country committed to an overseas empire. Tom Platt alone remained as an evil to be removed; but the election of 1900 brought Benjamin B. Odell to the governorship in New York, and, though none were aware, Platt's reign was practically ended. Dark days were ahead for the paper, but in 1900 it had achieved the triumph of its principles.

CHAPTER XIII

THE REGENCY

THE "campaign of education" which ushered the United States into its proud position as a world power was practically the last assumption of leadership by the *Tribune* under Whitelaw Reid. The paper's voice was still raised, but, during the first decade of the twentieth century, it was very nearly a crying in the wilderness. For the number of those who remained faithful to the journal "founded by Horace Greeley" was scant indeed.

Had the competition offered by the other New York papers remained on the same plane that Pulitzer and Hearst established, the influence of the old *Tribune* might have lasted longer, sharing with the *Sun* and the *Herald* the favor of those whose tastes led them to something less bizarre than the yellow journals. But in the same year that Hearst set the *Journal* on its clamorous way to prosperity, another man almost unknown in the circle of the New York press began a daring experiment—to gain mass circulation by conservatism. His success meant the ruin of the *Tribune*, as long as it persisted in the old fashions.

In 1896, the *New York Times* had fallen on evil days.¹ George Jones, successor of Henry Raymond in the ownership of that paper, died in 1891; his descendants were unwilling to finance a losing venture and unable to find men who could adapt the *Times* to a changing world. They sold out, at a stiff figure (\$950,000), to a group headed by members of the staff. The change was made just in time for the new owners to meet the full force of the depression of '93 with a treasury depleted by the purchase. The *Times* suffered greatly. By 1896, the paper printed 19,000 copies every day, and took back from the dealers 10,000 which remained unsold. In that year Adolph S. Ochs, the successful publisher of the *Chattanooga Times* took over the management of the paper. It was a dubious venture, for Ochs brought only \$75,000 of new capital with him. The *Times* had to pay its way or go out of existence—and in the

face of the adventurous and wealthy yellow journals, just then commencing their frenzied campaign for circulation.

Greeley in 1841 had been in much the same position, and had sensed that between the rowdy sensationalism of the *Sun* and *Herald* on the one hand, and the stodgy sixpennies on the other, there was room for a cheap paper which would give a temperate and complete news service. Ochs saw Hearst and Pulitzer, selling a spectacular brand of news and features for 1¢, competing successfully with such reserved and politically-minded papers as the *Herald* and the *Tribune*, which cost 2¢ and 3¢ respectively. He determined to appeal to that class which wanted neither the sensationalism of the one nor the partizanship of the other; to cover the news more completely than his rivals and present it without offending good taste or political prejudice.

The *Times*, then, retained its conservative, Democratic editorial policy. The simple, austere format was unchanged. But the paper took as its motto "All the News That's Fit to Print" and found a market for it. In place of the garish features and comic sheets of the yellows, the *Times* supplied dignified and informative articles. The Sunday *Times* was issued with an illustrated supplement, which served as the model for the *Tribune*, and a first-rate literary supplement was published—the *Saturday Review of Books*. This broke with the old tradition of the daily press, had criticisms by outside authorities, and of course gave a more complete and distinctive discussion of literary news than was possible in the routine fashion of sandwiching criticism in any available space of a daily or Sunday paper. It immediately began to attract those readers interested in literature, and, incidentally, the advertisers who appealed to them.

Ochs's policy brought the *Times* circulation up to 25,000 by 1898, and he then ventured on a bold stroke. On October 1, the price of the *Times* was cut to 1¢. The *Tribune* and *Herald* had been following the progress of Ochs benevolently, but they predicted that his paper could not maintain its standards at that price. They were wrong; Ochs found a "high class constituency at a low price" and his circulation tripled in one year. With a rapidly swelling exchequer, the *Times* was able to extend its news and feature services

on the lines laid down by the new management, and its success was assured.

Had the *Tribune* met this competition at the outset, cut its price, banished political views to the editorial page, in a word, pursued a policy of aggressive conservatism—the paper would have saved the Reid fortune considerable expense. But the power of tradition was strong. The staff was set in its ways and Reid was not inclined to change the grooves. He believed the “1¢ craze” would pass,² so the *Tribune* continued to sell at 3¢ for eleven years after the *Times* cut its price. About 1900, expenses became greater than income in the *Tribune* ledger, but instead of going after new business, economies were instituted, and the increasing annual deficit was paid by the owner out of his own pocket.

Even political events conspired against the *Tribune* at this time, producing a cleavage in the Republican Party which robbed the paper of some of its wealthier clients.

On September 6, 1901, the *Tribune* was crusading for civic righteousness. Prominently displayed on the front page was a box which offered \$1,000 reward to anyone giving “Suitable Information of Corruption Among High Police Officials.” The same page told of President McKinley’s visit to the World’s Fair at Buffalo, and of the enthusiastic crowds which greeted him. On the day this was published, a young anarchist named Leon Czolgosz stepped up from the line of admirers waiting to greet the President with his hand wrapped in a cloth. A shot—and McKinley fell, fatally wounded.

There rose, naturally, a cry of horror throughout the country. Beyond the avowed anarchistic tendencies of the assassin, the conservative press saw in the deed the results of the unrest inspired by Bryan and his single supporter in New York journalism, William Randolph Hearst. Interviews with Johann Most, the anarchist leader, were printed in the *Tribune* to that effect. But in addition to this more or less normal American reaction to assassination, the conservatives were alarmed at the prospect of Theodore Roosevelt in the Presidency. Resurrections from the political graveyard of the Vice-Presidency had proved exceedingly unsettling in the past—and Roosevelt had been quite deliberately interred. On Septem-

ber 15, immediately after McKinley's death, the *Tribune* thus voiced the fears and hopes of many Americans:

President Roosevelt must be well aware that his temperament has been regarded as less cautious and conservative than that of his predecessor, but he will not fail to justify the universal trust in his profound sense of responsibility as he steps into the place assigned to him by the constitution. If during a singularly active and varied career, in posts of public service permitting the incumbent to gratify a natural propensity to freedom of speech and attitude, he has not invariably seemed to take a duly serious view of weighty questions, there now exists not the slightest cause to doubt that he will repeat the common experience of able and upright men on whom great cares are suddenly devolved and nobly fulfill the hopes and expectations of the people. They will see no reversal of convictions and purposes at the capital.

Roosevelt's response to this appeal came in his first published statement as President, a promise to "continue absolutely unbroken the policy of President McKinley." Immediately stocks, which had broken badly at the news of McKinley's death, recovered from one to six points and the *Tribune* published a cartoon labeled "Confidence in Roosevelt," showing Uncle Sam pointing proudly to the market reports.

In one respect, the management of American foreign affairs, Roosevelt conformed exactly to the ideas laid down by the *Tribune*. He seized the opportunity of a very convenient revolution in Panama to write a treaty permitting the United States to dig a canal there, and for its protection he formulated, by a series of diplomatic moves, what has been termed the Roosevelt Corollary of the Monroe Doctrine; namely, that this country has paramount rights in the Caribbean, and that it will undertake to police that region rather than permit any other country to perform that much-abused function.

The *Tribune* had advocated the Isthmian Canal in 1898 as part of its program of expansion. The Caribbean policy was the natural offspring of the Canal, and the paper warmly approved the whole of Roosevelt's course in these matters. In his instructions to the office at the time of the Panama revolution, Reid maintained that recognition of the *de facto* government should be accompanied by

an avowal of the "actual sovereignty which the United States will be compelled to exercise" on the Isthmus.

It is a sovereignty somewhat similar to that which the inevitable application of the Monroe Doctrine in the countries actually within our sphere of influence must ultimately compel us to assume with reference to the whole region of the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico—as we have already assumed it with reference to Cuba.

In this, the *Tribune* and Roosevelt were at one with such ultra-conservative (in an economic sense) papers as the *Sun*. The *Sun*, which, after Charles Dana's death in 1897 and a brief period of control by his son Paul, had come into the hands of William F. Laffan and Edward P. Mitchell, pursued a policy of determined avoidance of the popular side and was the chief supporter of Wall Street in New York City. But there were other phases of Roosevelt's policy with which the *Sun* and its clientèle could not sympathize, and by supporting the President, the *Tribune* alienated some of its staunchest readers to the *Sun*.

The principal problem which Roosevelt had to face was the Trust, in the popular mind an expression covering any combination of business which, by integration under one ownership or by alliance in the form of pools, threatened to stifle free competition. Combinations in restraint of trade had been the object of suspicion since the 'seventies; a serious objection to the tariff was that it fostered such combinations, and in 1890, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, as vague in its terminology as the popular conception of the thing itself, was passed to check their growth.

The *Tribune's* attitude on the subject had always been practical, rather than doctrinaire. Whitelaw Reid was opposed to any government regulation which might check the legitimate growth of industry, but he was a sufficiently sincere individualist to recognize that combinations sometimes were achieved by unfair practices, and, when formed, were in a position of undue strength. In other words, while rejecting altogether the extreme views of Justice Louis A. Brandeis, that business must be decentralized, Reid did not quite condone the sentiment of the *Sun* that any governmental regulation was *ipso facto* tyranny.

This viewpoint is expressed in two editorials published in June, 1890, when the decision of the New York Court of Appeals dissolving the "Sugar Trust" was announced. On June 27, the *Tribune* said:

The mere possession of power vastly superior to that which individuals can wield according to the spirit of this decision is inimical to the welfare of the great body of individuals, and therefore to the public. It appears to be assumed that a power deliberately sought because it is superior to that of individuals will inevitably be wielded in a manner hostile to individual interests. There can be no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of this inference.

On June 29, this basic statement was qualified, and a distinction between "good" trusts and "bad" was urged:

Indiscriminate denunciation of every trust, whether it harms the public or not, whether it seeks or does not seek the power to harm the public, has done much already to dull the ears of many to all charges of monopoly.

President Roosevelt's first message to Congress, the *Tribune* believed, observed this distinction. In reference to combinations, said the paper, it was "not an impassioned denunciation of trusts addressed to a low order of intelligence and mischievous propensities," but "thoroughly temperate,"

. . . with clear discernment of the natural causes which have made combination the most conspicuous feature of modern industrial development, the immense benefits of which it is prolific, the evil tendencies which it involves, and the danger of hastily applying remedies which may be worse than the disease.

Thus far, the President, the *Tribune* and Wall Street were in substantial agreement. The division arose over the application of these sterling principles, and it followed hard upon Roosevelt's statement to the legislature. In February, 1902, the new President instructed his Attorney General, Philander C. Knox, to bring suit for the government against the Northern Securities Company for alleged violation of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, and Wall Street was tremendously annoyed. "Not since the assassination of President McKinley," said the *Tribune* financial column, "has the stock

market had such a sudden and severe shock."

The Northern Securities Company was a holding company formed by James J. Hill and Edward H. Harriman to pool their interests and bring an end to their rivalry for railroad control in the Northwest. This form of union was believed to be within the provisions of the Anti-Trust Act, and had generally superseded the old "trust" as a means of combination. Hence the action struck at numerous other holding companies and threatened the legal disintegration of great masses of capital. The *Tribune* supported the President, in the face of the wrath of the financial community, with which the paper had been hitherto on very good terms. When, in 1904, the decision of the Supreme Court dissolving the Northern Securities Company was announced, the paper said editorially,

The decision is a monument to the supremacy and efficiency of law, preventing, as it does, the indirect accomplishment of ends which are directly forbidden.

It will certainly bring home to the people a renewed sense of the responsibility of corporations to the law, and the adequacy of the United States government to control the great combinations which new forces and new industrial and commercial conditions have invested with extraordinary power, for the regulation of which it has sometimes seemed as if the law had, through lack of foresight, made no provision. Such a decision is not disorganizing but highly conservative in its tendency.

The financial groups were not willing to concede the conservatism of the Northern Securities decision, however, and their alarm at Roosevelt's course was increased by his intervention in the Anthracite Strike of 1903. The *Tribune's* position in regard to labor controversies had changed but little since 1877. It mistrusted unions, detested strikes in general and insisted that violence must be promptly and vigorously stamped out. While maintaining this fundamental attitude in the present instance (the paper rebuked the Governor of Pennsylvania for his laxity in enforcing order and highly commended the English Taff Vale decision which made union funds liable for damages incurred in strikes), the *Tribune*, in common with the majority of the press, found the intransigent attitude of the operators rather annoying.

The strike was serious; as winter approached there was a great scarcity of coal in the East, and public opinion clamored for a

solution. Roosevelt refused to imitate Cleveland and send Federal troops into the strike area. He was wholly without authority to compound the matter, but in an unofficial capacity he summoned a conference of workers and operators. It was in vain, and the President was forced to resort to the devious method of bringing pressure on the owners through Morgan. This was successful, and a settlement was reached.

The implications of this incident were somewhat confused. The *Sun* thought the President's interposition in a labor dispute on any other ground than that of suppressing disorder "extraordinary," "unprecedented" and "dangerous"; and the *Journal of Commerce* lashed out at his "seemingly uncontrollable penchant for impulsive self-intrusion." The *Tribune* itself was prompt to explain that Roosevelt was acting quite unofficially, that "no suggestion of interference to settle the strike by federal action" was involved. When, in 1904, Whitelaw Reid read over Roosevelt's letter accepting the nomination to the Presidency, he strongly urged that the coal strike intervention be stressed "as *not* an act of the Administration, *not* an act of the President, *not* an official discharge of any duty imposed by law or authorized by the Constitution," but "simply a volunteer interposition, unofficially, by the first citizen of the Republic."³ But while maintaining this conservative distinction, the paper applauded the successful upshot whole-heartedly:

For such a granting of the public desire and such deliverance out of present trouble and threatened disaster, the people of New York, of the whole Atlantic seaboard and in a measure the whole country, will be indebted to the tact, the courage and the masterful resolution of the President of the United States.

Still, the New York press as a whole was hostile to Roosevelt. The *World* and the *Evening Post* objected to his foreign policy; the *Sun* and the other ultra-conservative papers found him intolerable. As Reid wrote to the President in February, 1904, "One is lonely enough in the New York newspaper field at present in supporting the Administration." The *Tribune* continued to refer to Roosevelt's place in the main line of Republican tradition, to assert that he had "continued unbroken the thread of a successful party policy" and that his early endorsement by the state conventions was due to

"the scrupulous fidelity with which the President has fulfilled his promise to carry out the policies of McKinley." But it was a sufficient commentary on this last remark that "certain important financial interests" were behind a move to make McKinley's sponsor, Mark Hanna, President in Roosevelt's place; that when this proved impossible, some of these interests turned to the Democrats.⁴

More or less because of conservative mistrust of the Republican candidate, the Democracy reversed itself completely, relegated Bryan to the background and Free Silver to outer darkness, and nominated Judge Alton B. Parker, a New Yorker of unquestioned soundness on the money question, though quite obscure politically beyond the bounds of his state. The *Tribune* made merry with the "John Doe" candidate "whose record, personality and opinions are alike unknown," and accused the Democrats ("a conglomeration of unrelated fragments") of deserting their historical position in nominating a conservative.

The business of an opposition is to oppose—and to oppose with vigor, candor and thoroughness. . . . As founded by Jefferson and developed by Jackson, the Democratic organization was frankly and boldly radical. . . . Conservative Democracy is a misnomer, a paradox.

The *Tribune* was in the peculiar position of supporting a Radical Republican against a Conservative Democrat—but refused to admit it. Roosevelt won the election without difficulty.

Meanwhile, Thomas Collier Platt's long reign in New York State had slowly come to an end. Governor Benjamin B. Odell, with the enthusiastic support of the *Tribune*, built up a counter-machine, and by 1904 the Easy Boss was but a pale ghost of his former self. After the election of 1904, Roosevelt (so Platt said) politely requested that Whitelaw Reid be permitted to serve as Ambassador to Great Britain, and Platt graciously consented.⁵ John Hay had the pleasure of countersigning Reid's commission, and the owner sailed for London on May 27, 1905, an ambition at last achieved.

This event marked the formal end of Reid's journalistic career. Financially, the *Tribune's* position had been growing steadily worse for some time, and rumors were current in the city that the paper was to be sold. When he had taken the ministry to France in

1889, Reid had discussed with Blaine and Harrison the advisability of divesting himself of the ownership of the paper, and no doubt in 1905 this idea recurred with increased force. However, he determined to so organize the *Tribune* "that it would run absolutely without direction or responsibility" on his part during his retention of government office, but to retain the ownership until his son, Ogden Mills Reid, then a law student at Yale, should be able to take over the full management. He explained this step in a letter to Roosevelt.

The publication of a paper like the *Tribune* in competition with copper miners, railway owners and others who think it an advantage to their business to run a newspaper and sell it below the cost of manufacture, is not in itself a very alluring business proposition while the one-cent craze continues to prevail. But I have long looked upon my ownership of the *Tribune* as a sort of trust, and should not feel at liberty to divest myself of it without trying to insure its continuing to stand for good morals, good citizenship and the public policies with which the public has learned to identify it. If in office I should not assume to direct it; but I should be sure its general course would not depart from these established lines during my absence.⁸

The men whom Reid placed in charge as, in some sort, Regents until the experience of Ogden Reid should warrant his assuming the throne, were ample warranty for that continuity of policy which Reid sought. Donald Nicholson had retired, so his former assistant, Hart Lyman, became editor-in-chief on March 10, 1905. James Martin was made managing editor, but after a year, Roscoe C. E. Brown took his place and held the job until 1912.

Though well adapted to conserve the *Tribune's* traditions, the Regents were in some respects oddly chosen for the conduct of a metropolitan newspaper. In 1905, Hart Lyman was 56 years of age, 29 of which had been given to the service of the *Tribune*. For the most part, the new head of the paper had devoted himself to editorial writing, a subordinate function with no calls upon executive talent. Of late years, during the occasional absences of Reid and Nicholson, Lyman had been in charge, but he vastly preferred the scholarly seclusion of the editorial page. A cultivated gentleman, kindly and just in his relations with the staff, but sharing

Reid's conservative viewpoint, Hart Lyman was not the type to alter fixed modes of thought and action on the paper.

Roscoe Brown, upon whom fell most of the routine conduct of the *Tribune*, resembled Lyman in many ways. Though younger and more energetic than his chief, with considerable executive experience in various branches of the paper, he was (and is) a man of scholarly tastes, and one of those thorough gentlemen to whom the atmosphere of the old *Tribune* was so congenial. Like Lyman, he felt at home on the editorial page. He was a finished writer with a consummate knowledge of state politics, and it was much against his will that he permitted himself to be translated from his speciality to undertake the position of manager of the paper under the conditions which then prevailed.

For the Regents were handicapped by more than deficiencies of temperament and training. The paper was steadily losing money, and its owner was unwilling to attempt to recoup his losses by venturing greater sums in an aggressive campaign. He made up the annual deficit, but insisted on rigid economy. His ideas on the proper presentation of news had not changed, and he winced at every suggestion of a flashier style of make-up. Finally, Lyman and Brown both realized that they were "stop-gap" appointees. Reid's tenure of his office depended upon the uncertainties of politics, and he might well return within three years as he had done previously. Even if Reid remained abroad, he was only waiting for his son to fit himself for the task of taking over the *Tribune*, which would probably have occurred about 1913 even if Reid's death had not made it inevitable. Under such conditions, anything like a vigorously progressive policy on the part of the temporary incumbents was difficult. They were concerned only to keep the paper going on the old lines, with a minimum of expense, until a new and permanent regime might be established.

Under these circumstances, as may be expected, the *Tribune* went on in the old way, changing but little and failing to thrive. The need for economy becoming more exigent every year, gaps in the personnel frequently remained unfilled. The number of reporters dwindled and, even for local news, great reliance was placed on the press services. By 1912, the editorial page was writ-

ten almost wholly by three men—W. F. Johnson, William McPherson and Clinton Gilbert. Salaries were almost as low as in Dana's day.

Yet, in those unlucrative days, the life of the *Tribune* worker had a certain charm. The Tall Tower, still a landmark, though somewhat subdued by the near rivalry of the *World's* gilded dome, had taken on a kind of shabby homeliness in the thirty years which had passed over its head. The atmosphere of the office had that cultured dignity which one is more apt to associate with Fleet Street than with Park Row. If the managers fretted at falling sales and decreased advertising revenues, subordinates put their trust in the Reid fortune, and received their small but steady wages thankfully. Few men were hired or raised in pay, but on the other hand few were discharged or had their salaries cut.

Nor, despite the diminished staff, was the work on the old *Tribune* over-arduous. Those in authority were generally kindly; the tempo of the office was much slower than in most contemporaneous journals and the men in the city room had little difficulty in spinning the allotted dinner hour out to two or three, while the old building supplied many a cozy nook for a comfortable game of poker. Even though hard-driven colleagues of the press sneered, they felt the prestige with which long tradition invested the *Tribune* workers. Joseph Pulitzer, for instance, seems to have regarded Whitelaw Reid and his paper with much the same reluctant respect which a popular and successful painter of society portraits might have for the ascetic practitioner of art for its own sake. The *Tribune*, if a pensioner, was at least genteel, and many who served it during the Regency admit to a nostalgic longing for that tranquil period.

The editorial page of the *Tribune* has always been the paper's most constant factor, and this was particularly true during the years between 1905 and 1912. Hart Lyman did some writing, and his managing editor contributed occasionally. Dr. Johnson was the most prolific of the staff, and, with William McPherson and Clinton Gilbert, made up the page.

William McPherson was the son of Edward McPherson, the editor of the *Tribune Almanac* for so many years. After studying at Pennsylvania College and Harvard, William joined the *Tribune* in

1885 as a reporter. He was in the paper's Washington Bureau from 1889 until 1902, when he went over to the *Washington Times* for a season. In 1903 he returned to the *Tribune* as editorial writer, in which capacity he served until his death. He also took up his father's task of editing the *Almanac* until that publication was discontinued in 1914. McPherson was notable, even in the *Tribune*, as a marked conservative and a strict protectionist, and during the war his sympathy for France was a feature of his writings.

Clinton Gilbert was destined to play an important part in the *Tribune*, but before 1912, his influence was confined to the editorial page. He had come to the *Tribune* in 1895 as telegraph editor, a few years after his first entrance into New York journalism on the *Press*. Gilbert had a direct, forceful style and in due course became an editorial writer.

As in the 'nineties, the editorial writers worked more or less independently. Lyman, it is true, instituted a daily conference, but it was little more than a comfortable chat. The writers knew what was expected of them and wrote accordingly. Reid in London held a very light rein and the policy ran in well-worn grooves. The Republican Party found in the paper a constant source of comfort. Indeed, during Roosevelt's second administration, the *Tribune* was one of the two papers which the President read personally. As Archie Butt wrote in 1908:

He takes only the *New York Herald* and *New York Tribune*. He knows he will not find anything in them to upset his digestion.

"I could not stand the *Evening Post* or the *Sun* after a hearty meal," he said.⁷

And Taft must have found similar satisfaction in Reid's paper. It is a curious fact, however, that, after defending the first administration of Theodore Roosevelt as "truly conservative," the paper found it necessary in Taft's case to hail his acts as "truly progressive." A new spirit had been set in motion by the exuberant Rough Rider.

One rather important addition to the *Tribune's* apparatus for influencing public opinion occurred in 1910. In that year Royal Cortissoz was given *carte blanche* by Mr. Reid to secure the best cartoonist available. He chose Boardman Robinson, since widely

known as a mural painter. Robinson's impressive cartoons—loose, effective masses of black and white—were a feature of the paper until 1914.

The *Tribune's* critical staff suffered little change. Henry Krehbiel continued to watch the opera from "stall D15 on the ground floor" in the Metropolitan; Royal Cortissoz roamed the galleries and traversed the literary output; assisted, as in Ripley's time, by various members of the staff. William Winter resigned in 1909; one of the few major changes in personnel during the Regency. His place was taken by Arthur Warren.

The attenuated news staff reveals several names which were later prominent in the paper. F. Stuart Crawford was on the *Tribune* from 1897 to 1915, as political writer. He later served on the *Sun* and the *Herald*, and, in 1925, became Secretary to President Calvin Coolidge. On Coolidge's retirement in 1929, Crawford became editorial writer and political correspondent for the *Herald Tribune*, a position in which his long experience and practical contacts were of great value, until his death in 1936.

In 1905, Frank L. Simonds resigned his position as Albany correspondent of the *Tribune* to go over to the *Evening Post*. He had become a reporter on the paper in 1901, and served in the Washington Bureau as well as at Albany during his first short stay on the *Tribune* payroll. After ten years he was to return again, with great *éclat*, to the paper which had given him his start in journalism.

About the time that Simonds left, Arthur Draper came to the Tall Tower, fresh from college. Kindly, quiet and able, his advancement was rapid. From rewrite desk he passed to night city editor and acting city editor, and when Ogden Reid took over the editorship, Draper was made his secretary—an arduous and responsible position.

In 1906, two additions were made to the paper's news staff. W. Richmond Smith, born in Canada and with a distinguished record as war correspondent for the Associated Press during the Russo-Japanese War, became a staff writer on the *Tribune*. He specialized in civic finance, and wrote a notable series of articles exposing the weaknesses of the accounting system of New York City. In 1910, he was appointed chairman of the city Commission on Standardiza-

tion of Supplies, and before his death in 1933 he held several other municipal posts.

William Morris Houghton became a reporter in 1906, and remained on the staff until 1917. He was given feature assignments, and by 1912 was writing an occasional editorial, leading to permanent work of that type. In 1917, he went into publicity work for the Liberty Loans, and at the conclusion of the war became editor of *Leslie's Weekly*. In 1927, he returned to his old paper, by that time the *Herald Tribune*, as an editorial writer, leaving in 1933 to join Arthur Draper on the staff of the *Literary Digest*.

Among the occupants of the city room during Lyman's editorship may be mentioned Denis Tilden Lynch, the biographer of Tweed and Cleveland—still an important figure in the paper's reportorial staff; William Orr, star reporter, who distinguished himself during the Rosenthal murder case in 1912 and is now connected with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer; William E. Curtin, for many years the ship news reporter of the *Tribune*; George Burdick, copyreader, city editor and financial writer; and, at the end of the Regency, a large young man from Harvard, Heywood Broun, who was set to reporting book sales and other semicultural events before he found a more congenial sphere on the sporting page.

The daily ration of news supplied by men such as these was unquestionably good, if seldom startling. In reporting political events, the *Tribune*, for all its bias, was still excellent; indeed, Joseph Pulitzer wrote Reid, "I prefer its political news to that of all other papers."⁸ The rules on vocabulary remained very strict. William Orr, a capable and energetic reporter, assigned to do a series of articles on the Red Light district, found himself in embarrassing difficulties in the matter of verbiage, and was forced to ring a complicated series of changes on epithets of the "ladies of the evening" variety, to avoid shorter and uglier terms.

One notable innovation was introduced into the *Tribune* at the beginning of the century. Before 1900, the *Tribune* had no regular sports department. News of sports was handled by the city desk in the same manner as other items—usually one copyreader, particularly interested in the subject, made assignments and took care of the resulting copy. In 1900, George Burdick performed this function. George H. Daley, a recent graduate of Union College, was at

that time reporting occasional sporting events as a side line. He was so successful that in a short time he was asked to join the staff and form a sports department.

At the outset, this consisted of three men. Daley was interested in giving his page (it was just that, at first) the prominence which he felt it deserved, and, being allowed to choose his own type faces, used headlines, italics and pictures with a free hand. Daley also wished to instill a more interpretive treatment into the factual accounts of sporting events which were then customary on morning newspapers, and to create a personal and authoritative atmosphere by the use of signed articles. In this he was not wholly successful for some years; he was permitted to sign his own articles but only with his middle name—Herbert. After 1913, the use of signed articles became the rule.

In January, 1916, Daley left the *Tribune* to become sports editor of the *World*, returning to the *Herald Tribune* in September, 1931. His interest in sports has been rewarded by the unusual recognition of an honorary degree of Master of Arts from his *Alma Mater*, Union, and an honorary fellowship in Athletics and Activities from the same institution.

The appearance of the paper changed but little between 1900 and 1912. Minor type variations were introduced, a large front page photograph became customary, and the headlines were deeper, though never more than two columns in width. The daily edition seldom contained over sixteen pages, each of seven compact columns. The Sunday edition slowly expanded to about sixty pages, enlivened, after May 8, 1904, by the addition of a *Magazine*; twenty pages of glazed paper with a cover in colors, issued by a syndicate. The *Magazine* was a very creditable publication. The covers were done by some of the best illustrators of the day, and the contents included a good selection of short stories, well illustrated. Works by Arthur Conan Doyle and other popular writers were featured, and occasionally a sheet of music was thrown in as a special treat. The *Illustrated Supplement* continued to appear for a while after 1904 and then vanished. The *Tribune Index* was discontinued in 1907, a regrettable sacrifice to economy.

But, despite the fact that the *Tribune*, in its modest way, was a good newspaper, the circulation continued to fall off. The most de-

pressing factor, financially, was the plight of the Weekly. In 1900, that edition claimed 150,000 readers. In the following year, a direct bid for rural circulation was made by changing its name to the *Tribune Farmer*—but in vain. By 1911, the circulation of the *Farmer* was estimated at 70,000; in 1913 at 60,000.⁹ The period of the weekly edition as an adjunct of the metropolitan newspaper had really ended long ago. All the other New York papers had abandoned it, and in some cases (notably that of the *Times*) the Sunday edition partially took its place in appealing to out-of-towners. The surprising vitality of the *Tribune Weekly* derived from habit and tradition—as old readers died off, the younger generation took to local dailies which reflected the needs and interests of their particular communities.

In 1909, the *Tribune* management made a desperate and tardy concession to what Whitelaw Reid had called “the 1¢ craze.” On October 21 of that year, the price of the daily was dropped from 3¢ to 1¢. For a time, circulation picked up, but the gain hardly compensated for the loss of two-thirds of the circulation revenue. Indeed, by 1912, the net paid circulation of the daily *Tribune* was considerably under 50,000 and steadily diminishing. The price factor had evidently been a minor one in the paper’s loss of popularity, and it seemed that the *Tribune* must inevitably slough off some of its traditions or vanish completely.

The process of change, whereby the paper took on a new lease of life, really began in 1912. Four years before that date, Ogden Mills Reid left the law office where he had spent a short time practicing the principles learned at Yale, and became a cub reporter on his father’s paper. One of his first assignments was to interview the English journalist, Lord Northcliffe, with results so satisfactory to the subject as to inspire him to write to Whitelaw Reid in London:

New York
November 18, 1908.

Dear Mr. Reid:

When I was talking to Mr. Mills last evening he seemed so gratified at my observations on your son that I feel there can be no harm in writing and telling you my impressions of the young man’s work here. At my first encounter with him, neither my secretary nor I had any notion that he was your son and we were much pleased with the very

conscientious way in which he set about interviewing me. Afterwards we found out by accident who he was and I naturally observed him at public meetings and other places to which I went.

I must say that I think you have in young Mr. Reid the material for a very good journalist and a conscientious one. I was only sorry that I could not see more of him. I am so fond of my profession that it delighted me to see his keenness.

Yours sincerely,
Northcliffe.¹⁰

After this auspicious beginning Ogden Reid passed through the various stages of the city room: copy desk, assistant city editor and assistant night editor. By 1912, his father felt that he was ripe for responsibility, and in March he was made Managing Editor, Mr. Brown becoming Assistant Editor.

The new executive officer of the *Tribune* was in his thirtieth year. Dark-haired, smooth-shaven, athletic, somewhat nervous in manner, his personality formed in many ways a complete contrast to that of his father. He had been educated both at Yale and at Bonn, in Germany, but the circumstances of his breeding and education could no more conceal a warm friendliness of demeanor than rustic Ohio had been able to tarnish the suave dignity of Whitelaw Reid. Young Reid met his fellow reporters on a basis of convivial comradeship which quite overcame their suspicions of the "boss's son." In consequence he received a sort of affectionate loyalty that was quite distinct from the rather awed respect accorded to the elder Reid.

Ogden Reid possessed the family energy and an ambition to become more than an hereditary editor. If he lacked the intenser powers of concentration which a hard school had imposed on his father, he had the great advantage, as far as the *Tribune* was concerned, of possessing an experimental mind. He was instilled with respect for the traditions of the paper, and shared his father's ideals of government, but was not shackled by any Chinese reverence for older methods of journalism. Willing to test the new, he had unusual ability in picking men who would successfully venture.

Newspaper changes are seldom abrupt. Moreover, Ogden Reid was still a subordinate on the *Tribune*. However, within his sphere, he set about making alterations in the tone of the paper. He had distinct ideas as to his objectives—to emphasize news values, both by

covering events completely and rapidly and by presenting them in a striking fashion; to treat politics as news, reduce it to proper perspective, avoid overemphasis, and, as far as possible, eliminate political bias from the news columns.

The year 1912 was a lively one, well adapted to test the ability of a managing editor and to permit the application of his theories. Hardly had Ogden Reid been in office a month, when, at 1:20 A. M., word reached New York that the *Titanic*, newest and finest ocean liner on the transatlantic run, had struck an iceberg in midocean and was sinking. The impression which that news made was profound, as is evidenced by the fact that twenty years later moving picture audiences gasped audibly at the mere sight of the name of the fated ship on a life-ring. All the elements of drama were present; a huge, widely advertised floating hotel, bearing personalities of note from two continents, struck down a thousand miles from land on its maiden voyage. A very understandable feeling of panic struck the young editor as the wireless message from the sea was relayed to his office. But he rose to the occasion, loyally supported by an efficient staff. The first reports were meager—A. P. bulletins to the effect that the *Titanic*, having struck an iceberg, was sinking by the head and putting its passengers in lifeboats. Ships were speeding to the rescue; the sea was calm and the weather clear. On this slender basis, the whole paper had to be remade, to meet the importance of the case—and all in two short hours from the time that the first dispatch was received.

The pressure of the deadline was urgent; a new two-column head was inserted in the mail edition, cuts of the ill-fated ship and its captain prepared, and reporters sent hot-foot to the office of the White Star Line. Others assembled data on the passengers and crew of the vessel, the circumstances of its triumphant departure and the icefield into which it had blundered. This went into the city edition under a two-column headline.

The last edition went to press at 3:20, amid "a bedlam of noise—clicking typewriters, clicking telegraph instruments and telephone bells added to the whistle of the tubes that lead from the city room to the composing room, the press room, the stereotype room and the business office, the latter, happily, not in use." But amid the apparent confusion, "the cool, calm, deliberate way in which the manag-

ing editor smoked his cigar helped much to relieve the tension." All the copy was in on time, and the *Tribune* had a good paper on the street that Monday morning.

The next three days were busy ones on Park Row. No news could be received from the *Carpathia*, the rescue ship, and conflicting reports were issued by those in authority at the steamship offices. The Associated Press was forced to admit its helplessness—even "President Taft's requests for information, addressed to the *Carpathia*" were ignored. The big story would break when the Cunard liner docked on Thursday night.

The *Tribune's* plans to cover this event were complete. It was first reported that no reporters were to be allowed to board the ship at the pier, and only by unusual pressure were the newspapers able to secure a limited number of passes. The *Tribune's* quota was four. Reid engaged a tug to meet the *Carpathia* in the harbor; then, as the night was foggy, sent another tug as insurance. Both tugs met the rescue ship, but with disappointing results. No newspapermen were allowed on board and little information was obtained by shouting across the water. The pier was still the great point.

In a building near the dock, four private wires to the *Tribune* building were installed. This was the *Tribune* headquarters. Sixteen reporters were assembled. Four were given the special dock passes and a long list of questions to ask survivors and rescuers. The rest were equipped with police cards and ordinary Customs passes, which had been canceled, but which, it was hoped, might possibly be used to "wangle" an entrance to the pier. The hotels, theaters and offices of the line were to be covered by men assigned for that purpose. Those who could not gain admittance to the pier were to cover the crowds and the relief work in the vicinity, and to relieve the men with the special passes. A fleet of autos was provided, and, in the office, four men sat at the ends of the private wires to take down the stories as they came in.

This efficient organization functioned admirably. When the men who obtained admittance to the pier accumulated their facts and dashed for the 'phones, they gave their passes to other reporters, who in turn boarded the docked *Carpathia*. In this manner, a

steady stream of facts poured into the Tall Tower, and the *Tribune* on Friday morning was a thing of joy to Ogden Reid and his able city editor.¹¹

The alert and vigorous handling of the *Titanic* story gave Reid confidence, and served notice that the *Tribune* was still a competitor in the race for news. In the meantime the political pot was bubbling furiously and soon gave the editor an opportunity to demonstrate his attitude toward reporting events in that contentious realm. Theodore Roosevelt had broken completely with William Howard Taft, his political heir, and was, so to speak, endeavoring to cut him off without the proverbial shilling. The *Tribune*, like many Republicans, found the Taft Administration soothing after the turmoil of Roosevelt, and the paper sturdily supported the organization. When Roosevelt struck off on his own and split the party by accepting the nomination of the Progressives, the *Tribune* was very bitter against the Rough Rider. It roundly asserted that he had wrecked his party, because he was unable to rule it. "Perhaps," said an editorial after the election which made Woodrow Wilson President, "he takes pride in his achievement conscious that

The aspiring youth that fired the Ephesian dome outlives in fame the pious fool that rais'd it."

It was not easy to introduce even the semblance of nonpartizanship into this campaign, when it seemed that the whole great Republican Party was going to smash, when the Progressive platform demanded a popular referendum on Supreme Court decisions, and the triumphant Democrats spoke of an unsettling "New Freedom" and a reduced tariff. But, to a certain extent, Reid succeeded in injecting his ideas into the paper. The Republican convention was reported by Samuel G. Blythe, long Washington Correspondent of the *World*, in a spirit of cynical detachment, and even the regular staff caught the new spirit in part, and left the brunt of the fighting to be borne by the editorial page. A beginning had been made.

The revival of the *Tribune* as a force in metropolitan journalism had proceeded thus far as the year 1912 drew to a close. Ogden Reid was about to join his parents in England for the Christmas

holidays, when word reached New York of the sudden severe illness of Whitelaw Reid. He was seventy-five years of age and worn out by his labors. Asthma, his chronic complaint, made terrible inroads on Reid's strength, and on December 15, 1912, Greeley's successor died.

CHAPTER XIV

EXPERIMENTS

THE death of Whitelaw Reid definitely ended the Regency. Elisabeth Mills Reid now owned a controlling interest in the *Tribune*, and she was anxious to organize the institution on a permanent basis along the lines indicated by her husband. While retaining her ownership for several years, Mrs. Reid gave her son a free hand in the administration of the property. In all larger matters she forbore from interfering, cheerfully giving counsel or financial assistance when required. Her wishes, mostly directed toward matters of detail, were expressed in the form of requests, and while the editor was prompt to accede to them and to govern the paper according to their spirit, he never felt them a hindrance. Indeed, Mrs. Whitelaw Reid's most potent influence was the respect which her son and his assistants felt for her judgment in matters of taste, and the high standards which she inspired.

The new order was formally established on March 1, 1913. Hart Lyman resigned as editor-in-chief, and Ogden Reid took over that office. Mr. Brown had already felt his position of assistant editor somewhat anomalous, and left the paper; Clinton Gilbert, of the editorial staff, took his place. William C. McCloy, a competent journalist, was made managing editor.

The new editor-in-chief approached his task without rigid formulae. A few fundamental principles were established by the implications of his actions rather than by words, for, innately modest, he lacked the will to dramatize them. In substance, his aim was to develop the *Tribune* as a newspaper, in the spirit of its traditions without abject subservience to them; to make it an economic success without compromise of principle; to meet the freer tone of modern journalism without loss of dignity.

In method, Ogden Reid was unconventional. At his hands, Whitelaw Reid's system of permitting subordinates a free hand in their department was greatly extended. The father in his later

years had built up in the paper a series of traditions which were taken for granted and never questioned by the staff. The son had no such apparatus and was readily approachable. He set up success in the attainment of his general objectives as the only standard, and remitted the details, in great measure, to the men who worked under him.

The success of this type of editorial control depends largely upon the skill employed in selecting assistants, and here it must be generally recognized that Ogden Reid has shown to advantage. Men of ability were encouraged to work out their ideas, and a number of distinctive personalities were developed, unhampered by jealousy or a predominant reputation on the part of the man in authority.

Ogden Reid's principal interest lay in the field of news; his theories had been developed during his short tenure as managing editor and he continued to impress the need for complete coverage, impartial and interesting treatment, upon his collaborators. But it was also necessary that the attention of the city be attracted to the new departure by new features, a lively editorial policy and direct advertising. All of which required the courage to depart from established traditions, an alert sense of public demands—and money.

Mrs. Whitelaw Reid was willing to back the change financially; her son and his assistant, Clinton Gilbert, supplied the other qualities. The office of assistant editor was an innovation in the paper. Under Whitelaw Reid, the managing editor had general control of all departments, directly subordinate to the editor. The appointment of Mr. Brown as assistant editor was a temporary arrangement without any clear definition of the responsibilities of the post. From 1913 on, however, the office of managing editor was usually confined to control of the news department, with the assistant editor taking over the function of coördinating news, editorials and features. There have been periods when this situation did not exist; since 1933, for instance, there has been no assistant editor on the *Herald Tribune*.

Clinton Gilbert, assistant editor from 1913 to 1917, was in his early forties when he assumed that title. A fine figure of a man, handsome and impressive in bearing, he had very decided convictions and a determined manner. From long service, he knew the *Tribune* well, and had clear and radical ideas as to the way in which

it should be conducted. Especially was he impressed by the need for fresh and attractive feature material.

The year 1913 was passed in preparing the groundwork for the changes to come. One incident of prime importance in the paper's history occurred at the end of that year, however, which, while not a direct result of the efforts of the young administration, is another evidence of the *Tribune's* consistent devotion to the ideal of a free press and a landmark in the jurisprudence of journalism.

Appropriately enough, the event has its legend, though, as commonly told, the legend does not square with the facts. The story runs that on an evening in December, 1913, William Curtin came into the dusty city room on Park Row, very excited. Curtin was the *Tribune's* ship news reporter, the delight of his colleagues for his mimicry of the exotic characters who came within his beat. He had difficulty in translating this talent into print, however, and good stories did not often come his way. On this occasion he was jubilant and took particular pains with his copy. George Burdick was city editor, a polite, almost shy, gentleman with a keen news sense and an appreciation of the value of time. He hovered behind Curtin's desk, eager to get the copy, while the reporter fumbled for the just word and ripped up lead after lead in disgust. Finally Burdick's suspense got the better of him and he tapped the distraught writer on the shoulder, saying: "Mr. Curtin, just one word after another." The phrase has been cherished ever since as the epitome of wisdom in writing against time.

The actual inception of the story occurred on December 18, 1913. Curtin received information that two persons, of some prominence in the society columns, were to be charged with conspiracy to defraud by the Federal Government in the matter of a diamond and sapphire pendant brought into this country without payment of duty. The investigation had been conducted secretly. Curtin telephoned the details to the office, Harry Kingsbury wrote up the story, and it appeared next morning on the front page of the *Tribune*, an "exclusive." On December 31, 1913, another story from the same source appeared concerning a similar investigation and charge against a wealthy manufacturer and former member of Congress. Both of these reports were shortly followed by the trial and conviction of the parties named.

The Treasury Department had a ruling to the effect that official information was not to be divulged by subordinates without consent of the Secretary. To discover the person responsible for the breach of this rule, Curtin, Kingsbury and Burdick were summoned before the Grand Jury for questioning. Kingsbury was speedily dismissed. Burdick and Curtin refused to answer, on the technical grounds that to do so might incriminate them. There was a statute relating to conspiracy to break a governmental regulation under which the two *Tribune* men might have been prosecuted, but their real objection to testifying lay, of course, in the old tradition of loyalty between newspapermen and their news sources—the same tradition which had sustained White and Ramsdell before the bar of the Senate.

Burdick and Curtin were summoned a second time before the Grand Jury, and on their repeated refusal to betray their informants, pardons signed by President Wilson were offered, freeing them in advance from any penalties to which they might make themselves liable by their testimony. City editor and reporter remained obdurate, and were cited before Judge Learned Hand for contempt.

Judge Hand admitted that the case seemed to present a nice question of the limits of the Presidential power of pardon, but he fined the men \$500 each and remanded them into the custody of the Federal Marshal until they should purge themselves of their contempt—i. e., testify. The case was promptly appealed and, in due course, a year later, came before the Supreme Court. On January 25, 1915, decision was rendered.

The newspapers, following the case with much interest, were naturally concerned with an assertion of a right of privileged communication between reporter and informant, comparable to that between lawyer and client, although the *Tribune* also declared that the Treasury ruling and its reaction on members of the press constituted an "insidious censorship." The Court did not consider these aspects, but confined itself to the Constitutional question raised by the Presidential pardon. A precedent was discovered in Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in *U. S. vs. Wilson*: "A pardon may be conditional; and the condition may be more objectionable than the punishment inflicted by the judgment." Asserting the

essential similarity between this action and the one under review, the Court reversed Judge Hand's decision and the two *Tribune* men were vindicated.

The press was not slow to point out the advantage it had gained by this outcome. The *Times*, for instance, in its account of the case stated: "The effect of the decision is very largely to sustain the confidential relationship between a newspaperman and persons supplying him with news," and in an editorial the belief was expressed that, while there was no explicit statement of privilege, practically the decision "had the effect of settling that point."¹

While this case was winding its slow way through the courts, the rejuvenation of the *Tribune* began to get under way. There was a crying need for features that would pull circulation, especially for humorous features. The paper had acquired a painful reputation for overseriousness, fostered by the sprightly malice of the *Sun*, no longer an enemy but an extremely candid friend. On one occasion a blaze broke out in the *Tribune* shop and the zealous fire department deluged the office with gallons of water. "But," said the *Sun* next day, "the *Tribune* came out this morning just as dry as ever."

To correct this impression, and to make possible the employment of distinctive *Tribune* features, the paper organized its own syndicate. Eugene Parcells was the first manager, and in the beginning of 1914, two celebrities made their bow to the *Tribune* audience. Franklin Pierce Adams, the F. P. A. of the *Conning Tower*, was well known to New Yorkers through his ten years of service on the *Mail*. His *Conning Tower* is a "colyum" in the authentic tradition of Eugene Field, a *mélange* of poetry, jesting and comment seasoned with real thought. A columnist has come to mean, in popular speech, anyone who signs his name to a periodical article, be it on sports, gossip or politics, and it is refreshing to see the older type maintained as a unique feature of American journalism. The *Conning Tower* appeared in the *Tribune* from 1914 until 1921, except during 1917 and 1918, when Adams was in the army. In 1921, he moved over to the *World*, returning to the *Herald Tribune* in 1931.

The other acquisition of 1914 was Clare Briggs, the cartoonist. Briggs had started newspaper work on the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, wandering thence through several Eastern and Western papers. The seven years preceding 1914 were spent on the *Chicago*

American and Examiner. Then George Daley suggested that he be brought to the *Tribune*. Briggs was a peculiarly apt choice for the type of family newspaper that the *Tribune* sought to become. His pictures appeared in the sports pages, but his subjects were not confined to that department. Instead, they roamed at large through the homelier phases of American life with a sure touch. "When a Feller Needs a Friend," "Mr. and Mrs." and "the Days of Real Sport" took an instant hold on the American people and were widely quoted and parodied.

Briggs remained with the paper until his death on January 3, 1930, and his influence has been recognized in the choice of his successors. "Mr. and Mrs." still appears anonymously, though, with a somewhat unusual respect for the original creator, such catch-phrases as "Mamma love Papa?" have been omitted. C. T. Webster's "The Timid Soul" and his bridge fiends have also been installed to maintain the Briggs atmosphere in the *Herald Tribune*.

The wholesome policy of injecting humorous features spread through the paper. Naturally, the Sunday *Tribune* was especially affected. In the fall of 1914 a four-page colored section was added, experimentally. It was not a complete success and was abandoned after two years. In 1915 Arthur Folwell, editor of *Puck*, was made Sunday editor, and important changes took place in the edition. The old *Magazine*, supplied by an outside syndicate, was dropped, and the paper turned to the development of its own material in the body of the paper. As a supplement, a rotogravure section was presented and, with the abounding public interest in the World War, the pictures became a permanent feature. Folwell's administration of the Sunday edition gave added impetus to the amusing feature. One of his artists from *Puck*, W. E. Hill, was brought to the paper to draw a weekly page, "Among Us Mortals," a successful satirical survey of the American domestic scene. Montague Glass turned out a sort of Yiddish Mr. Dooley, and Robert Benchley "the worst reporter in New York City," as he modestly described himself, found a more agreeable *métier* in a weekly humorous article of the type for which he has since become famous. Even informative articles were treated in a lighter vein. Deems Taylor, for example, the composer of *The King's Henchman*, wrote pieces on such journalistic *curiosa* as Dwight Franklin's miniatures. Taylor was Assist-

ant Editor of the *Sunday Magazine* in 1916, and correspondent in France during 1917.

The new spirit spread into the news and columns. Ogden Reid inaugurated the system of sending general reporters to foreign posts, rather than editorial writers. Fred Pitney, an able local man, was sent to London, with the result that the cables lost some of their politico-cultural atmosphere and became straight news dispatches, with a human interest that was not exclusively bounded by Westminster, Chelsea and Mayfair.

Local news felt the same impulse; headlines became lively, even flippant, as when an account of a society show for a worthy cause was briskly headed "Buds in Bloomers Pose for Charity." Late in 1914, Robert E. MacAlarney, a short story writer of repute, since connected with the cinema and managing editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, became city editor of the *Tribune*. MacAlarney strove to lighten the weight of the "Grocer's Bill" with an insistence upon literary form, with occasional unhappy results. Some impressionable reporters tried to convert every item into a contender for the O. Henry prize. But the net effect was good, and has not been forgotten.

The sports department, where George Daley had been trying for years to inject more color into his pages, naturally benefited by the removal of old barriers. In 1913, he secured Heywood Broun from the rewrite staff as baseball reporter, and Broun's picturesque accounts amply justified his selection. Furthermore, in 1915, Grantland Rice, an enthusiast of sport, whose interest in the subject was expressed in his column, the *Sportlight*, in lordly and allusive prose and frequent poetry, was brought by the Syndicate to the *Tribune*.

In the same year, a writer of quite different temperament came to the paper. Broun had been named dramatic critic, and Daley asked him to choose a successor. Broun nominated a baseball commentator on the *Journal*, masked under a pseudonym, and was empowered to offer the unknown \$50 a week to transfer his talents. If necessary he might raise the bid to \$55. Broun sought out his quarry and discovered W. O. McGeehan, newly arrived from San Francisco. Somewhat embarrassed at the prospect of bargaining with a stranger, Broun blurted out: "Mr. McGeehan, I'm authorized to offer you a job on the *Tribune* at \$50 or \$55 a week. Which do you

prefer?" McGeehan took \$55.

Shortly after McGeehan's arrival on the *Tribune* Daley left the paper for the *World*, and, after a brief interregnum, McGeehan took his place. He was a sports editor of a distinctive type, skeptical, biting in comment and subtle of wit. Readers found this attitude refreshing in contrast to the fulsomeness of the average sports writer. McGeehan remained at the head of the department until 1920, when he was made managing editor, a position he had held earlier on the *San Francisco Post*. After a little more than a year, he went over to the *Herald*, as sports editor again. The purchase of that paper by the Reids in 1924 brought him back, this time as an independent sports commentator for the Syndicate. His death in 1933, after a long illness, terminated a career that was bringing him into serious consideration as a stylist, apart from his undoubted success as a chronicler of sports.

With the freer play of vocabulary on the *Tribune* went another change which emphasized the personalities behind the scenes. This was the introduction of the by-line, instead of the occasional use of initials. Denis Tilden Lynch was the first to win a by-line for a news story, but the practice became common during 1914. George Daley was thus justified; the paper gained in authority and the traditional anonymity of newspapermen was to a large extent removed.

The editorial cartoons were in time affected by the changing atmosphere of the *Tribune*. At the outset Boardman Robinson was the paper's cartoonist; his free, impressive drawings were powerful, if somewhat overwhelming. Clive Weed and W. F. Starrett, his successors, used a similar technique, but with a lighter touch. Foreign cartoons, especially those of Raemakers and Fornaro, were frequently reproduced during the war years—grim evidences of the tragic spirit of the day. In 1917, however, the Tribune Syndicate obtained the services of Jay N. Darling ("Ding"), cartoonist of the *Des Moines Register*. Darling's work was of a very different sort than that of his predecessors. A man of independent spirit and liberal views, he drove home his points without hatred or maliciousness. Even the Kaiser looked merely ludicrous in Ding's cartoons; the artist was better in expressing admiration for his heroes than

detestation for his villains. Nevertheless, his happy characterizations were so popular that a gentle rap from Ding became more effective than a thundering blast from some more gloomy prophet.

The foregoing emphasis upon the *Tribune's* contributions to the gayety of nations, at a time when tragedy was the dominant note in the world, may leave the impression that matters of serious import were slighted. This is very far from the true picture. Indeed, the paper has seldom been so zealous an advocate for the causes which it thought worthy as during the first five years of Ogden Reid's editorship. This zeal was no doubt encouraged by a recognition of the value of crusading from a promotional standpoint; in greater part it sprang from the vitality of a renewed organism and from the yeasty atmosphere of the World War. In a later chapter, the *Tribune's* reactions to the war itself will be discussed, but here some description of the paper's service to journalism is in order.

In 1913, the United States had an uneasy consciousness of the existence of many evils in advertising. In 1912, a Federal law had been passed requiring the distinct labeling of paid advertising. A year later, the New York State legislature made the publication of false or misleading advertisements a misdemeanor. But the letter of the statutes permitted numerous breaches of their spirit, and the *Tribune* determined to supplement them by an individual campaign, to educate the purchaser and to align public sentiment on the side of the laws.

The crusade began warily with the institution, in 1913, of *The Tribunal, A Supreme Court of Advertising*. In this department

. . . the man or woman of character and ability wanting employment; the responsible employer wanting reliable and efficient help; the man or firm desiring capital for their business, or those wishing to dispose of anything that will stand the fullest investigation, may go before the readers of the *Tribune* with their statements indorsed by this paper.

An additional fee was charged for the investigation involved in the indorsement, and the *Tribunal* advertisements were printed in a separate column, in distinctive type. The scheme was not very popular, however, and the paper determined on a course of general

investigation. In 1914, the motto "First to Last the Truth: News, Editorials and Advertisements" was adopted, and an announcement at the head of the editorial page read:

The *Tribune* uses its best endeavors to insure the trustworthiness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of all advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

To make its position even more emphatic, on November 17, 1914, the *Tribune* took a bold step. It announced that henceforth the paper would guarantee its readers "absolutely against loss or dissatisfaction through the purchase of any wares advertised in its columns." It would not be necessary, the announcement continued, for the customer to prove an actual loss on the purchase; mere dissatisfaction would be sufficient to invoke the guarantee. "If you don't like what you buy you get your money back promptly, either from the seller or from the *Tribune*."

The next step of the paper, after purifying its own columns, was to throw the light of publicity upon dishonest advertising wherever it showed its head. For this purpose, Samuel Hopkins Adams, who had "muck-raked" patent medicine frauds in *McClure's Magazine* and who had presented the problem of the newspaper and its advertisers in a novel, *The Clarion*, was engaged to write a series of articles. In introducing him in January, 1915, the *Tribune* said:

Under the leadership of the honest advertising interests of the state, a law was passed by the New York legislature of 1913 making intentionally false or misleading advertising a misdemeanor. The enforcement of the letter of the law or the universal acceptance of its spirit would render superfluous the *Tribune's* current campaign against the frauds of print. Until such a time, however, as the vital principle of the statute is generally adopted, the sole protection of the public, of the upright merchant and of the honest advertiser lies in the type of publicity and exposure which is the informing spirit of Mr. Adams's series of articles.

This series was general in its nature, though illustrated by concrete examples. At its conclusion, the *Tribune* began, as Adams put it, "to separate the sheep from the goats." A Bureau of Investigation, headed by Adams and called the *Ad-Visor*, was set up and the public was invited to forward their problems under the following conditions:

- 1st. That the questions be fair in spirit.
- 2nd. That they have to do with advertising or advertised merchandise.
- 3rd. That they call for the expression of such opinions only as can be based upon actual and ascertained facts.
- 4th. That the name and address of the writer be given with the understanding that it shall be held confidential if so stipulated.

It may be observed that inquiries were not restricted to advertisements appearing in the *Tribune*; they could be, and in fact often were, concerned with shop window signs as well as with periodical advertisements, and the broad field thus opened supplied the Bureau of Investigation with work in plenty. Adams dealt vigorously with all sorts of fraudulent and semifraudulent schemes, from the petty chicane of "Fire Sales" to extensive stock swindles. In one case, the *Tribune* refused the advertising of a large department store until it promised to amend its ways.

It was to be expected that such plain dealing would cause work for the *Tribune* legal department. A swarm of libel suits were brought, which had varying results. The first of these suits to come to trial formed a curious illustration of the workings of the law of libel as well as of the public appreciation of the *Tribune's* campaign. A rug dealer sued the paper on the basis of one of Adams's articles. In defense, the *Tribune*, assisted by a merchant's association which resented the plaintiff's business methods, brought evidence of the truth of its allegations. The jury found for the rug dealer and awarded him 6¢.

One offshoot of this fight for honest advertising was the *Tribune's* decision to refuse all advertisements of alcoholic beverages. In 1916, the Prohibition movement was gathering that final momentum which led to the passage of the Eighteenth Amendment, aided by widespread public mistrust of the legislative and business methods of the "liquor interests." On April 1, of that year, the *Tribune* announced its policy in an editorial which has occasionally been misquoted and which therefore deserves repetition in full:

From today on the *Tribune* will publish no liquor advertisements. We have discontinued this sort of advertising purely as a matter of business policy. We are not going to declare war on the manufacture, sale or use of alcoholic liquors. We do not believe that conditions in this state are ripe yet for prohibition. We believe that it is wiser to leave

to individuals—at least for the present—freedom to choose between use and non-use of alcoholic stimulants.

But as a matter of business policy we recognize the fact—emphasized more forcibly as each year passes—that indulgence in alcohol is incompatible with efficiency in any field of effort. In industry, trade and transportation, as well as in artistic and professional pursuits, the man who uses alcohol habitually imposes on himself a serious disability. When alcohol is mixed with business, it is alcohol which profits, not business. It is our conviction also that when alcohol is mixed with advertising, it is alcohol which benefits, not advertising. The *Tribune* is setting new standards of quality. It intends to keep its advertising columns select and unimpeachable. It wants to eliminate from them all traces of suspicious association. We feel that liquor advertisements will not help to attract to us either the readers or the advertisers whose patronage we especially desire. We have therefore decided to drop liquor advertisements altogether.

This statement of principle is sufficiently explicit. Furthermore it is consonant with the *Tribune's* whole attitude toward the liquor traffic—advocacy of individual temperance and mistrust of statutory prohibition. The paper's stand a few years later, when Prohibition became a national issue, will be discussed in a later chapter.

The advertising crusade reached its peak in 1916, when the *Ad-Visor* was most active. Thereafter Adams's column continued to appear, but with less frequency, until 1918, when it practically disappeared. The guarantee, however, remained in force until 1924, when it was dropped on the occasion of the purchase of the *Herald*. At that time the management felt that the primary purpose had been achieved; newspaper advertising was on a higher plane and the majority of advertisers were themselves convinced of the necessity for an honest presentation of their wares. If true, this was ample justification for a campaign that was not without its vexations. From the standpoint of the paper the expenses and annoyances were probably well worth while. The young administration had given a notable example of courage in the face of an active suspicion on the part of the readers that newspapers were dominated by their advertisers, and had gained thereby in self-esteem and public respect.

Clinton Gilbert's term an assistant editor came to a close in 1917, when he was placed on the roll of feature writers, specializing in Washington correspondence. During his four years of executive

work he was assisted by several managing editors. William McCloy left in February, 1915, and was succeeded by Geoffrey Parsons. Parsons came to the *Tribune* in 1913, as editorial writer, after ten years with the *Sun*. He was managing editor for a year, but found the editorial page a more congenial *milieu* and returned to it in April, 1916. In 1924, he became chief editorial writer of the *Herald Tribune*, a post for which his scholarly temperament, broad interests and distinguished style made him peculiarly well-fitted.

Parsons was followed as managing editor by T. E. Niles, who in turn gave way in May, 1917, to Ernst Henry Gruening of the *Boston Traveller*. Gruening's stay was short; in the hysterical condition of American opinion at that time, his German ancestry and a purely accidental connection with the editor of the *Evening Mail*, just revealed as the property of German propagandists, led to his departure after a few weeks. It should be remarked that Mr. Gruening, since widely known and respected as a liberal journalist, promptly enlisted. The whole affair was one of those unfortunate episodes inseparable from war.

On July 1, 1917, Garet Garrett, a financial writer on several New York journals, who had been with the *Tribune* since the previous year, became managing editor, practically succeeding Clinton Gilbert as Ogden Reid's second-in-command. Garrett was a man of abounding energy and courage, temperamental and decisive, who exercised a great influence over the course of the paper. Probably his most enduring contribution was to bring order out of the somewhat chaotic appearance which the paper was assuming under the pressure of war news and crusading zeal.

Since 1913, the make-up of the *Tribune* had been put under a great strain, and many changes occurred in the old, staid format. One minor alteration which was made in 1914 is interesting. Ever since the founding, the masthead of the paper bore the title *The New-York Tribune*. For many years the hyphen was employed in the text of the paper; gradually it disappeared from all but the masthead. Finally, on April 16, 1914, the quaint anachronism was dropped altogether.

A more important change took place a short time later. On June 23, 1914, the width of the *Tribune's* page was increased from 7 to 8 columns. More space thus became available, and the type size was

enlarged, making a lighter, more attractive page. Photographs and headlines were used more freely, set off with white space, and the special demands of the *Tribune's* crusading activities led to a greater variety in make-up and typography. For example, the *Ad-Visor* was two columns wide, in large type and with distinctive crossheads, surmounted by a cut of the sheep and the goats which it was endeavoring to separate. War news demanded boxed stories, pictures, headlines, special bulletins and other typographical devices. The older dark but neat page dissappeared, leaving an interesting but rather messy substitute.

Garrett set about to regulate this condition. He experimented with type faces, and eventually decided upon a uniform style, Bodoni, for all heads. This is a handsome face, not often used in newspaper work, and has proved very successful. Sufficient variation may be introduced by the use of italics and different sizes of type to prevent monotony, and yet retain the impression of unity throughout the paper.

A uniform scheme of make-up was more difficult to arrive at. Garrett succeeded in producing a good first page, but it required several years of experimentation, the end of the war and the adoption of a less sensational editorial policy to bring the *Tribune's* make-up to its present high state of excellence. The war was something over which Garrett had no control; as for the editorial policy, he was a "fighting editor" himself, and the leader in one of the most bitter newspaper wars (as far as conflict of policy is concerned) of the Twentieth Century. But that was an offspring of the *Tribune's* relations to the World War, which are interesting and important enough to warrant detailed exposition.

CHAPTER XV

BELLIGERENT NEUTRALITY

THE *Tribune*, in common with the rest of the American press, had been taken by surprise by the stunning actuality of a great European war. Generally speaking, American editors in 1914 were not versed in the intricacies of diplomacy. Furthermore, the constant alarms of the opening years of the twentieth century had induced that familiarity which breeds contempt, even for catastrophe. Movements for world peace seemed gaining strength; on June 25, 1914, the day on which Archduke Franz Ferdinand arrived at Illidze in the recently annexed province of Bosnia, the *Tribune* devoted a hopeful leader to the approaching World Church Peace Conference, one section of which was to meet at Liège, on August 2—truly an ironical concatenation of purpose, place and time.

On June 29, the headlines announced the assassination of the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, but the sinister implications of that event went unnoticed on this side of the water. There was sympathy for the aged Emperor, some speculation on the tragic destiny of the House of Habsburg, but American interest in Europe speedily centered again on the Caillaux trial and on the conflict between Nationalist and Ulsterman in Ireland. Only on the financial pages were "Rumors from Vienna" seen to be disturbing the peace of the world.

Then, suddenly, on July 24, the press informed the nation that Austria had dispatched an ultimatum to Serbia, that war was imminent and likely to be far-reaching.

The events of the succeeding two weeks, that whirl of notes and telegrams and obscure *démarches*, left the *Tribune* puzzled, but with the germ of a policy. At first the paper (and its reactions were typical of a majority of the press of this country) ¹ felt that Austria was the aggressor, that "Germany has been drawn irresistibly along by her pugnacious ally." On the larger plane, the swiftly growing tragedy was laid at the doors of the military auto-

crats, who felt that war "with all its dangers, is better for them than the slowly losing struggle they are now making against the oncoming democratic revolution." The efforts of England to keep the peace and the quiescent attitude of France were adduced as further evidence that the approaching conflict would be one of democracy against autocracy, a powerful element in determining the sympathies of the American people.

The *Tribune* was further impressed by Germany's ultimata to France and Russia. They stood in high relief against the muddled background of the "Fourteen Days," and transformed Germany, already suspect from the "over-eager military spirit of the great mass of the German people," into the prime mover of the whole catastrophe. The *Tribune's* hostility to the Triple Alliance, fostered by Austria's sharp note to Serbia and Germany's compliance therein, was thus intensified and focused.

The emotional and intellectual alignment of the paper was well-nigh completed by the invasion of Belgium. The editorial treatment of this event was temperate but severe; the violation of the neutrality treaties was found "too reminiscent of the old-fashioned Prussian policy of 'blood and iron,'" but a cartoon showing the Kaiser wading through "Belgium's Blood" was more prophetic of the future atmosphere. The thesis of Germany's unique guilt had been fairly well established by August 4; it was sustained and elaborated upon by the conditions of war-time journalism abroad.

The outbreak of war brought with it a sudden accession of journalistic responsibility and opportunity. A crowd of correspondents descended upon Belgium to observe and report the titanic struggle. The *Tribune* engaged Gerald Morgan, and subscribed to the syndicate of Richard Harding Davis, the greatest of the old school of correspondents in this country. In addition, the paper purchased the proofs of a number of English newspapers, of the *Morning Post*, the *Daily News* and the *Daily Chronicle*, all of which threw numerous reporters into action immediately.

In consequence, the *Tribune*, like so many other American papers, received the news of the early days of the war almost solely from English sources. Numerous complaints were received by editors in this country that the news was being "doctored" in the interests of the Allies, but since the cable from Germany had

been cut, the American press was at the mercy of the English and French censors. As the *Times* plaintively pointed out: "At this moment the New York papers would pay very high prices for news direct from Germany."

Such news as did come through from Belgium was frequently fantastic. The day when Russell conversed with kings at Sedan was past, and the correspondents of 1914 were pitched into Armageddon with no other credentials than their wits could provide. One resourceful Britisher motored across half of France on the strength of a pass which permitted him to enter the War Office at Whitehall. At first these men went to the front, unauthorized, but not distinctly prohibited. Then England and France, adopting the German scheme, ordered on August 18 that henceforth all military information would be given through General Headquarters, and requested the press to withdraw their men. Such bold souls who lingered on found themselves in constant jeopardy, and were frequently arrested, jailed, and sometimes in danger of being backed against a wall and shot as spies.²

Another of the discomforts of life as a newspaperman with the warring armies in 1914 was the huge scope of modern war. The amount of territory which a correspondent could actually see was but a tiny fraction of the whole, and, rebuffed at headquarters, he was dependent for information upon officers as confused and ignorant as himself. One general officer informed Richard Harding Davis that the guns he heard were British, and that Canadian troops were five miles away. At this time, the British artillery was at the Channel and the Canadians were in Montreal. On the nineteenth of August, a correspondent contributed a rather startling dispatch to the *Tribune*, to the effect that French cavalry had just executed a brilliant maneuver, equal to those of Sheridan and Stuart. The account was headed "Allies Sweep On, Hurling Foe Back." One officer taking part in "this extraordinary man-hunt," was reported as hoping "that the Germans would make a stand before they reached the Rhine." And this while that great series of engagements was developing which sent the Allies flying toward Paris!

A third woe of the correspondent, and one of the most annoying of all, was the censorship. New to their work, the censors made up

in zeal what they lacked in experience, and, as a disgusted reporter of the liberal *Daily News* remarked, they passed nothing but atrocity stories which should have been blue-penciled with the rest. One very striking example of the effectiveness of the British censor appeared in the *Tribune* on August 22, in a story sent by the paper's London correspondent, and apparently purporting to describe the official reaction to the Battles of the Frontier:

Censor Cuts Out Details of Recent Crucial Battles

The *Tribune's* correspondent filed a dispatch this morning which was evidently intended to describe recent engagements. The following is what the censors permitted to be sent:

London 8/21/14 (Filed 1:30)—There are two views taken here of Thursday's news from the continental battlefields, one optimistic and the other pessimistic. The truth is probably to be found somewhere between the two. A really decisive encounter between the Germans and the Allies in this theatre of war, according to this theory, is yet to come.

Here you have the pivotal point whereon turns the question of the views taken here as to whether the optimistic or the pessimistic is nearer the truth.

Hardly an illuminating statement. Yet this war, in which the journalist was so fettered by official disapproval, by the censor, and by the overwhelming size of the canvas he was to color, gave at least one example of war correspondence in the grand manner, and the *Tribune* was able to present to its readers one last *tour de force* of style and initiative in newsgathering on the field of battle. As the English correspondents retired before the German rush through Belgium, Richard Harding Davis remained behind at Brussels. The invaders swarmed through the city, and hour after hour Davis sat by the window, noting the perfection of their discipline and their equipments, watching the army pass in an unending stream: "not men marching, but a force of nature like a tidal wave, an avalanche or a river flooding its banks." He wrote while the tramp of feet and thunder of wheel still echoed under his window, and managed to capture at least some of the drama of war. Then, since he was held in semi-imprisonment, unable to leave the city or reach a wire, Davis gave the dispatch to his assistant, a young Englishman named E. A. Dalton. Dalton took the manuscript and made his perilous way along the line of the invaders'

march, finally reaching Ostend. Here an emigrant boat took him to London, where, after three days of toilsome travel, his story went on the wires.

The first hectic period of military journalism ended with the battle of the Marne and the retreat of the German army to its fortified position on the Aisne. About this time the English decided to admit a certain number of correspondents to the front, including a representative of the Associated Press, Frederick Palmer. The *Tribune* thereupon placed most of its reliance for first hand news upon the reports of his service. The paper's representatives at London and Paris, Fred Pitney, C. L. Garvan, C. Inman Barnard and, a little later, Arthur Draper, made frequent trips to the front, but usually had to be content to collate the bulletins from various official sources and forward them to the home office. George Smalley, who had founded the *Tribune's* London Bureau as the clearing house of European news, continued to contribute articles on political subjects until his death in 1916. But the *Tribune* ceased to take any individual action to secure war news at the front until 1917, except to send Gordon Gordon-Smith to the Balkans.

In place of the battle pieces of the old type, sent by men on the spot, journalism began to place greater emphasis upon the critic at home, who, with the aid of official *communiqués* from both sides, was able to present a comprehensive view of the progress of the war game. This was the inevitable result of the huge extent of modern fighting, and was made possible by the slow development of tactical moves after September of 1914. A policy of attrition over a front which covered all of Europe, part of Africa and Asia, and sent offshoots into the Seven Seas, did not demand speedy readjustments of opinion. Therefore, men like Colonel Repington and Hilaire Belloc in England, and Frank L. Simonds in America, attained great reputations on the strength of their discussions on the grand strategy of the war. The correspondents were largely useful in giving such bits of color as were available to their restricted view, and even in this, their place was somewhat usurped by the mobilized men of letters who, after tours of the front line, contributed special articles which found their way to the Sunday editions of the press.

In this shift of emphasis of wartime journalism, the *Tribune* was fortunate in securing the man who was probably preëminent in

interpreting the military and diplomatic situation of Europe to America. At the outbreak of the war, Frank L. Simonds was editor of the *Evening Sun* and foreign editor of the *Review of Reviews*. In these positions he soon became noted for his wide grasp of the manifold factors of the European struggle. Basically, he viewed the war as an attempt on the part of Germany to upset the balance of power in that continent, and to assert her own hegemony. This would be of serious import to the United States, already somewhat alarmed by the questing glance of the Kaiser, falling on the Philippines, Samoa, and Venezuela, but restrained by the counterpoise of the Triple Entente. To Simonds, then, the war was a matter of great moment to this country in a diplomatic sense, since our tranquillity was in a manner bound up with the success of the Allies.

Simonds came to the *Tribune* in January, 1915, as chief editorial writer. In this position he had full charge of the editorial page, subject only to Ogden Reid and his assistant. Simonds's own writings while in this post were distinctive. They included not only the detailed *résumés* of the current situation abroad, which were his most characteristic product, but pieces of a more emotional character. Of this latter type, the most notable is probably the stirring editorial written on the anniversary of the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which received the Pulitzer prize.

The advent of Simonds introduced a new force to the editorial page of the *Tribune* and gave direction to the wrath which was rapidly accumulating against the Teutonic Powers. The events of the latter part of July and early August, especially the invasion of Belgium, had produced a strong feeling against the policy of the German government. The confusion of the news sources during August had tended to increase that feeling to horror. In the midst of the dislocation of the innocent Belgian populace, atrocity stories sprang up on every hand. In the midst of much that was apocryphal, indubitable instances of German severity in the suppression of *franc-tirage*, such as the stupid military execution of Louvain, gave verisimilitude to the whole. Protest and counter-claims from German sources had too much the appearance of a *tu quoque*, and even the statement in rebuttal of five American journalists, including Irvin S. Cobb (who later repented him of his heresy), which was based on a two-hundred mile jaunt with the German army, and con-

tained an emphatic denial of the general tenor of atrocity stories, fell on ears already filled with horrific details to the opposite effect.³

The *Tribune* was especially susceptible to the atrocity story, because of the great amount of news which it received through British sources, and the pro-Ally sympathies of Davis. The latter had sent an account of the burning of Louvain which he witnessed while passing to the Allied lines from Brussels, and the horror provoked by his recital was increased by a cartoon of Boardman Robinson, which powerfully presented the German invasion as the "Return of the Goth." A conviction of the unholy nature of the German technique of war added considerably to the *Tribune's* growing sympathy for the cause of the Entente.

But it was not until 1915 that to this sympathy was joined a belief that the interests of this country, as well as its ideals, were involved in the European struggle. At the outbreak of war, there was a general tendency on the part of the American press to rejoice that our isolated position "insulated" us, as the *Sun* put it, from the effects of the struggle. Indeed, after the initial financial shock was weathered, boom times began to set in. The *Tribune* visioned a new merchant marine, and new opportunities in South America, rising out of the war. But, in the midst of this rosy view, the *Tribune* had a gift of Cassandra-like prophecy which is interesting to note today. Said an editorial, just before the armies began to march: The approaching war will stimulate trade. Prices will rise, production will increase; first in steel and wheat and then right on down the line. America will prosper. Then peace, and—

. . . a collapse of our foreign market. The result to us will be an industrial depression lasting perhaps for years, out of all proportion to our temporary appearance of prosperity.

The steel-clad knuckles of Mars were fated to give Uncle Sam's outstretched palm a more immediate blow than the *Tribune* foresaw. The way of a neutral is hard. It was not easy to communicate directly with Germany, but Great Britain made it even more difficult by extending the contraband list and interpreting the rule of "continuous voyage" in such a manner as to greatly restrict the shipment of goods to the neutral nations contiguous to Germany. The *Tribune* regarded this difficulty as a matter which called only

for tactful handling on both sides, but supported the President's note of protest.

In retaliation, on February 4, 1915, Germany declared the waters about the British Isles a "war zone" and warned that neutral vessels might be in danger, owing to the exigencies of submarine warfare. The use of this weapon had been threatened in December and had only aroused the *Tribune's* mirth. "Von Tirpitz Tries His Hand at Fiction" was the paper's estimate of the potency of under-sea warfare. But a formal declaration of the submarine blockade was a different matter. In comparison with this threat to neutral lives, the *Tribune* expressed the opinion that the British method of search and seizure was "not a major issue."

Nevertheless, some in this country felt that the only way out of the position in which the United States found itself was to resort to Jefferson's expedient in a similar case and declare an embargo on shipments of contraband. The question was agitated in the *Tribune* editorial rooms, and the embargo found some strong support. Nevertheless, Ogden Reid lost no time in stating the paper's position in an unmistakable fashion. Herman Ridder, the editor of the *Staats-Zeitung*, wrote requesting his opinion on the question. Reid responded with a signed letter at the head of the editorial page, in which he asserted roundly that he believed such a course contrary to the interests of the country, and implied that those who promoted it were endeavoring to make trouble.

Instead of the embargo, urged the *Tribune*, the President should take a firm stand in the matter of the War Zone Proclamation.

We have no wish to urge precipitate action in such a crisis. One thing is clear, however—the time to protest, the time to make our national resolve clear, is now. When the American flag has been flouted and an American ship torpedoed, the opportunity for clearing away disputed contentions will be poor indeed.

To give force to the arguments of those who favored some sort of embargo, the British Government replied to the German action by proclaiming a "cordon blockade," that is, a blockade maintained by a line of ships at a considerable distance from the ports declared closed. This was a plain infringement of international law, to which the *Tribune* would not have the country submit. The indignant

editorial which greeted this Order in Council declared that the cordon system could not "be justified in law or in reason," and that it was a "flagrant subversion of neutral rights" which America should resist on behalf of the other neutrals. The announced intention of Sir Edward Grey to convert his informal blockade into one in accord with the principles of international law soon stilled the *Tribune's* reproaches.

In the meanwhile, the German submarine blockade seemed to have ended with its proclamation. The President had warned Germany that she would be held to "strict accountability" if American ships or lives were lost while traveling on their lawful occasions, through the execution of this order. No retraction had come from Berlin, but on the other hand no American ships were sunk. An isolated event, the sinking of the sailing ship *William P. Frye*, became known early in March, but the act had been committed by a converted merchantman, the *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*, and was disavowed by the home government. It caused some excitement, but the German offer of reparation soothed the Americans and the incident passed over. More important was the sinking of the *Falaba*, a British ship, in which an American lost his life. This occurred on March 28. In spite of the anger aroused by these occurrences, the *Tribune* felt that one man was a paltry bag for the blockade which the Germans had announced with so much earnestness, and the paper began to return to its earlier jocular mood on the submarine menace.

On the first of May, 1915, the shipping pages of many metropolitan newspapers bore the announcement that the *Lusitania*, "Fastest and Largest Steamer now in Atlantic Service," would sail that morning at 10. On the same page appeared this notice:

Travelers intending to embark on the Atlantic voyage are reminded that a state of war exists between Germany and her allies and Great Britain and her allies; that the zone of war includes the waters adjacent to the British Isles; that in accordance with formal notice given by the Imperial German Government, vessels flying the flag of Great Britain or of any of her allies are liable to destruction in those waters and that travelers sailing in the war zone on ships of Great Britain do so at their own risk.

Imperial German Embassy
Washington, D. C.

April 22, 1915.

The *Tribune* regarded this warning as of a piece with the original war zone proclamation and remarked, with rather ill-timed sarcasm:

It is one thing to be a successful and dreaded lawbreaker. It is another to be compelled to call the world's attention by newspaper advertising to your ambition to be a terror of the seas.

This editorial was followed, on May 3, by a cartoon along the same lines, picturing the German Navy as a sheep in the wolf's clothing of "Blockade Advertising." By way of commentary, the headlines of the same issue carried the news of the sinking of the American ship *Gulflight*. This was turning jest into earnest in good truth, but worse was to follow.

Public indignation had scarcely time to form over the *Gulflight* case when the evening papers of May 7 announced the sinking of the Cunarder *Lusitania*, which had left port the week before with 1,924 men, women and children. Torpedoed without warning, 1,198 sank with her, including 114 Americans. The American press, with hardly an exception, denounced the act in the most scathing terms. "Wholesale murder," "War by Assassination," "a deed for which a Hun would blush, a Turk be ashamed, and a Barbary pirate apologize," were some of the phrases that flamed in thousands of editorials on May 8.

For the *Tribune*, the sinking of the *Lusitania* was more than a cause for empty wrath; it was a declaration of war:

If Germany murders Americans, turns her artillery against neutral Americans, sparing neither age nor sex, what worse treatment can she reserve for an American nation resolved to defend its honor, its citizens, its women and its children?

What can there be left for men or nations to do but to resort to that method which in all ages has been the last resort against tyranny and anarchy?

To the *Tribune* there was only one answer to these questions, and it waited for the President to make good his threat to hold Germany to "strict accountability." On May 9, the paper embodied in an editorial the policy which it felt the government must pursue. America must demand immediate reparation, disavowal and apol-

ogy, and guarantees against the recurrence of such a crime. If this were refused,

We shall not make war now to avenge those who have been murdered; however white hot our anger in the presence of our dead. But we shall not continue to avoid war if the question becomes one not of avenging those who are dead but of defending those who still live.

Convinced that Wilson would follow this policy, the *Tribune* refrained from criticizing the President, even when he made his famous "too proud to fight" speech. On that occasion, the *Tribune* affirmed its faith in the President, asserting that America would not mistake the tenor of his speech, though expressing the fear that it might be misunderstood abroad. A cable from London confirmed this suspicion, for the paper's correspondent there, after canvassing the opinions of the English press, claimed "It is doubtful if ever there had been a phrase from a public man so inept."

The *Tribune's* confidence that Wilson would take a strong line on the *Lusitania* case was destined to undergo a slow disintegration. The President was, as the *Times* put it, "with conscience seeking to avoid the great calamity of war," and preferred diplomatic action to a show of force. The success of this policy in causing practical disavowal and offers of reparation in the *Sussex* and *Ancona* cases failed to satisfy the *Tribune*, which clung to its main point. Whatever concessions Germany might make in practice went for naught in the paper's estimate, as long as that power still avowed the *Lusitania* sinking and refused to renounce the principle involved.

Finding that the President refused drastic action, the *Tribune* in December endeavored to carry the question to Congress, and called upon the Republicans there to "offer and press for passage a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to suspend all relations, diplomatic and other, with the Imperial German Government until such time as the *Lusitania* crime is disavowed and the Imperial German Government agrees to send to the Hague the question of indemnity."

Congress, however, took no action. In its slow course, the German government's final reply on the *Lusitania* arrived on May 5, 1916, almost a year to a day after the sinking. In this note, the Germans promised to abide by the rules of cruiser warfare in their sub-

marine campaign, but in turn demanded that Wilson insist on British observance of the letter of international law. Thereupon, the *Tribune* burst forth:

Plainly, brutally, Mr. Wilson and the American people are told that they must attack Great Britain or endure German terrorism. . . .

This, then, is the end. No nation can submit to such conditions and maintain its honor, its dignity or its safety. No nation can consent to attack another under the threat of a third. . . .

Mr. Wilson can do but one thing. He must break off relations with the Imperial German Government without delay and without hesitation.

The answer to the German demand was another note. On May 7, the anniversary of the *Lusitania* sinking, Frank L. Simonds wrote a moving editorial deploring the failure of America to realize that her safety and honor were bound in the repulse of "the attack upon civilization by barbarism" which Germany had unleashed.

The tone of defeat and shame which pervaded this editorial was the product of the *Tribune's* slow awakening to the fact that America did not want to go to war, and was ready to put up with much to avoid it. When the nation had risen in almost unanimous wrath and horror on the day when the sinking of the *Lusitania* became known, the *Tribune* felt that the country was conscious that Germany was our enemy; that whether

. . . we join now in the war, whether we now draw our own sword, henceforth until the destruction of those who today dominate Germany and shape her policies the American people will look upon the nations who are fighting the Germans in Champagne and Flanders as their Allies.

The *Tribune's* only fear then was that the government at Washington would not correctly interpret "the real decision of the American people." But the long course of diplomatic correspondence of the year that followed, and the patience with which Congress and the people bore it, soon showed that Wilson did in reality represent the nation. By November of 1915, the *Tribune* had been forced to the reluctant admission:

Let us be perfectly frank in the matter. The vast majority of Americans have no appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict in human history. To them it is just another war, and all wars are reprehensible

and all nations engaged in them criminal. We are permeated with pacifist flapdoodle. . . .

In the light of this conviction, the *Tribune* felt that more was needed than a change of administration. The temper of our democracy must be hardened, its formless national consciousness shaped, before the concepts of honor and interest which the paper believed essential could guide the actions of government. The test of democracy to the *Tribune* was not the ability of its leaders, but the extent to which those leaders were forced by the national will into courageous action. The paper did not find its ideal of democracy in England, where the press and public

. . . seem still to believe that the war will be won by a miracle because the Germans are wicked; that God will do for the English what they have not done for themselves; that Germany is going to curl up and go generally to deep damnation of a sudden because of the wickedness, the essential sinfulness of the Hun.

Nor did America measure up to the *Tribune's* conception of democracy in being. On the contrary:

In the moment of great peril, in the hour when all that was best in life and civilization was at stake, when the very structure of our democracy and of democracy in the whole world was endangered, the American people have turned their backs upon duty and chosen the easy road of safety and prosperity, when men and women professing the same faith and creed were giving all for the cause of humanity and civilization.

France, clear-eyed and fighting, was the star to which popular government must turn for hope and guidance:

Democracy has failed in England as it is failing in the United States. It has failed because it has not bred up men who can lead, who have courage, faith or vision. It has not failed in France, because the nation has taken over its own leadership and the men who are in office (weak men for the most, too) march to the command of a people who are facing facts without illusion and without dismay.

Such hope as there is for democracy must be found in France, not in England or America; it must be found in the fact that the people have proven themselves to be brave and true.

Acting on this conception of democracy and patriotism, the *Tribune* set itself with all its force to crusade for the reinvigoration of America. As an effective means of so doing, and as an essential corollary of the idea of militant nationalism, the paper brought all its strength to bear on the advocacy of increased strength in the military and naval establishments of the country. This campaign had begun in the early months of 1915, when the insecurity of our neutral position first became manifest, and had received a great accession of strength from the *Lusitania* episode. The press took up the cry, and the "movies," a new weapon of propaganda, added to the clamor.

To this growing demand, in which the *Tribune* took a leading part, President Wilson responded in crabwise fashion. In his message of 1914, he had decried any attempt to change the pattern of American defense as yielding to panic, and had affirmed his faith in the volunteer system, based on the militia and a small standing army. The *Tribune* rejected this scheme, dubbing it "the citizenry-called-casually-to-arms idea" and claimed that the only efficient solution, as well as the only one suited to a democracy, was some form of universal conscription, in the Swiss and Australian manner.

The events of the neutrality controversy and the general demand for an increase in our armed force led the President to give new consideration to the problem of national defense. Shortly after the *Lusitania* episode, he called upon the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to submit reports on the state of their departments. The *Tribune* remarked with some justice that the Commander in Chief was a bit tardy in this attempt to ascertain the condition of his forces, since he had then held the post for over two years.

The results of the reports were embodied in the President's message of December, 1916. The *Tribune* found therein little indication of a real change of heart in respect to military affairs. The message proposed an increase of about 30% in the little standing army, bringing it to 141,843. The chief reliance of the President was placed in the so-called "Continental Army," a rationalization of the "citizenry trained and accustomed to arms" which the President had extolled in his 1914 message, and which the *Tribune* had regarded so contemptuously. This "Continental Army" was to consist of 400,000 men, who were to bind themselves voluntarily to

serve with the colors for short periods throughout three years and to be subject to call during three years thereafter.

The *Tribune*, as I have said, believed that universal service, "a corollary of the principle of democratic equality," was the only logical solution of our military problem. But it recognized that, under the conditions then existing, the deep-rooted opposition of Americans to conscription made this an ideal impossible of realization, and was willing to further any move which would help bring America out of its defenseless condition. The President's plan, however, fell short of the paper's minimum requirements. It held that the second line of defense, whether Continental Army or National Guard, should not be the primary object of any scheme of army reorganization. The most vital need of the country was an enlarged standing army, the only efficient force available for immediate service, and the only real training school for officers. Therefore, said the *Tribune*, let the standing army be at least 250,000 strong—sufficient to resist a surprise invasion, and to supply enough raw material to give the officers who would command the second line practice in handling troops.

Though holding this view, the *Tribune* found in the Administration's plan at least a step in the right direction, and the paper was inclined to credit Secretary of War Garrison with good intentions in the national interest. The President also seemed moving in the direction of a more vigorous foreign policy. In a speech on January 27, he said, significantly, "There are some things Americans want more than peace. We won't seek war, but we won't try to avoid it if it becomes a necessity."

The *Tribune* was elated at this, and a cartoon was published showing Wilson expunging the "too" from his statement "There is such a thing as a nation being too proud to fight." Unwilling to hinder the President in his progression toward the *Tribune's* viewpoint, the paper announced that it would refrain from criticism of his preparedness program. Though unable to wax enthusiastic over that policy, the *Tribune* hoped the President's championship might yet arouse public enthusiasm for the cause of national defense, which would be some gain. Adverse comment on details of the plan might merely depreciate the credit of its spokesman and injure the cause, said the *Tribune*. "Therefore it proposes to re-

frain from all such comment and contribute, in such measure as it can, to providing Mr. Wilson with the fairest and freest possible opportunity to appeal to the people on behalf of national defense."

This tacit support of the Administration lasted less than a week. Early in February, Wilson was touring the West, speaking for preparedness. On the 3rd, in the course of a speech at St. Louis, he said: "The American navy should, in my judgment, be incomparably the strongest in the world." This the *Tribune* professed to regard as pure bombast, which no one seriously interested in the cause of preparedness would utter. The paper therefore concluded that Wilson was merely rendering lip service to the prevailing sentiment, and would drop the business if it became unprofitable to him. The President, said the paper, "has marched with many associates," and it asked, has he not, "broadly speaking," deserted them all for "political or personal advantage?" So ended another of the many occasions when the *Tribune* in vain endeavored to get in step with Wilson.

The navy, upon which Wilson had fastened to make his plea, was in fact in far better condition than the army. Furthermore, the pro-Allied group of preparedness enthusiasts were a bit sensitive upon the subject, since the pro-Germans frequently used the cry for a bigger navy to arouse prejudice against England and Japan. The *Tribune* approved of the general principle of a navy "second only to Great Britain," but concentrated most of its fire upon the administration of the existing establishment under Secretary Daniels. "A self-satisfied bungler" was one of the milder terms applied to him, and the paper continued to press for his removal. Another reform urged was the establishment of a Naval General Staff, to coördinate the strategy of the Department.

In spite of the fact that the *Tribune's* program for the navy was somewhat more limited than that which the paper advocated for the military branch, chance presented the paper with an opportunity to dramatize the whole question of preparedness through the navy. The *Tribune* seized it gratefully. Editorials and special articles might arouse the thoughtful, and much space was devoted to more or less technical discussion of the subject by experts. But the editors realized that to impress the many-headed required an

appeal to the imagination.

On February 3, the following letter was received:

Brooklyn, N. Y.
Feb. 2, 1916.

To the Editor of the *New York Tribune*,
Dear Sir:—

I read in your paper every morning a lot about preparedness. My Grandpa and my great Grandpa were soldiers. If I was a boy I would be a soldier, too, but I am not, so I want to do what I can to help. Mama gives me a dime every week for helping her. I am sending you this week's dime to help build a battleship for Uncle Sam. I know a lot of other kids who would give their errand money if you would start a fund. I am thirteen years old, and go to Public School No. 9, Brooklyn.

Very truly yours,
Marjorie Sterrett.

I am a true blue American and I want to see Uncle Sam prepared to lick all creation like John Paul Jones did.

P. S.—Please call the battleship America.

The *Tribune* thought the idea of a fund a good one, and published the letter. The response was immediate. Theodore Roosevelt was solicited and became one of the first contributors to "Marjorie's Battleship," sending a three-page letter and \$1.00—10¢ for each of his four grandchildren, and the remaining 60¢ as a contingent fund to provide for future arrivals. With this august approval, the plan spread rapidly. A committee of editors was formed to assume control of the fund, and a button, with a picture of a dreadnaught and the inscription, "U.S.S. America," was distributed to all contributors. A benefit performance for the fund was given at the Hippodrome in New York, and a ball in Boston. Ships of the navy took up collections and presented the proceeds to Miss Sterrett on the quarterdeck with much *éclat*. Noted contributors included Thomas A. Edison, Rear Admiral Sigsbee of *Maine* fame, and Charles F. Murphy. A "German-American" sent a \$500 Government Bond anonymously, the largest single contribution, and a pedigreed bull came from Connecticut.

A bill was introduced in Congress to permit the application of the fund toward the construction of a battleship, and promptly died in committee. Secretary Daniels gave the movement a chilly reception at first—alleging that the raising of funds for naval con-

struction by popular subscription was contrary to precedent and public policy. In December, 1916, however, when the fund in the *Tribune's* possession had reached over \$20,000, the Secretary proposed to use the income from the fund to distribute annual prizes to enlisted men of the navy for battle efficiency. This proposal was accepted by the committee of editors, and the excitement over Marjorie's Battleship speedily died down.

The practical results of the preparedness campaign were disappointing to most of those engaged in it. The unmilitary folkways of America were not abandoned. Beneath the loud insistence which proclaimed the need for greater armaments ran a steady stream of opposition from those who from principle or economy denied the necessity for drastic change. "I Didn't Raise My Boy To Be A Soldier" was a song of the day, and, though Colonel Roosevelt sneered that it should only be sung with a companion piece, "I Didn't Raise My Girl To Be A Mother,"¹ the jingle undoubtedly represented a substantial popular sentiment. A more rational opposition to the extreme expansionists was offered by publicists who were willing to accept some increase, but thought the viewpoint of Hudson Maxim, Roosevelt and the *Tribune* exaggerated. Wilson was a member of the moderate group, in spite of a few outbursts of the kind which had provoked the *Tribune's* suspicion. His chief journalistic spokesman was the *New York World*, which expressed the principal argument against any great change in the army estimates, cogently, although with some exaggeration: "No nation can land millions of trained soldiers on these shores, and we are not going to keep millions of men under arms to meet a visitation so incredible."

Congress acted on the problem by a characteristic compromise. The "Continental Army" scheme of Wilson was attacked by the militia interests, which feared that their "48 little armies" would suffer from the nationalization of the idea. As these interests were powerful, the "Continental Army" was dropped, to reappear in diminished form as the "Plattsburg Idea," whence comes the present Reserve Officers' and Citizens' Military Training Camps. In place of Wilson's scheme, more attention was paid to the existing militia, and the Regular Army was raised to 186,000 officers and men. Wilson adopted this amendment, in spite of the opposition of

Secretary Garrison, who resigned in consequence. On this the *Tribune* felt that its worst fears had been realized, for the paper had always credited Garrison with "sincerity." The Hay Bill, as the Congressional plan was known, passed eventually, and the great preparedness debates ended with something very like the birth of a mouse.

The public eye now began to focus upon politics. The first Democratic administration since 1896 was drawing to a close, and the Republicans prepared to make a strong bid for return of the supremacy lost in the Progressive split of 1912. But what the issue, and who the man to restore the Grand Old Party? The first question the *Tribune* found, for its own part, easy to answer. In October of 1914 the paper had expressed fear lest the war serve "as a cloak for the failure of the Wilson Administration," and lest the depression which loomed on the horizon in July be forgotten in the stimulation of commerce and industry incident to the war. This threatened crisis the *Tribune* ascribed to Wilson's attacks "not alone on Big Business but on all business," and deplored the depreciation of Federal credit as due to the "unwise sacrifice of tariff revenue and vicious extravagance in appropriations" of the Democratic regime.

Two years of war had caused a broad shift in emphasis. By 1916, the *Tribune* not only declined to consider the measures of the "New Freedom" as valid campaign material, but claimed such legislation as the Federal Child Labor Law, the enlargement of the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Rural Credits Act, Income Tax and Federal Reserve System as the work of both Republicans and Democrats—"the result of a general broadening of ideas, of education along economic lines by which all parties have benefited." The only real issue of the campaign, said the *Tribune*, would be "Americanism versus Cowardice."

This issue, with war with Germany as its almost inevitable practical expression under the *Tribune's* doctrine of Americanism, found in Theodore Roosevelt its greatest protagonist. His public utterances on the war paralleled the *Tribune's* statements with curious exactness. True, the Colonel had at first condoned the invasion of Belgium, which the *Tribune* had immediately condemned, but Roosevelt had atoned for his initial error by insisting

that the United States was in honor bound to declare war on Germany for her breach of the Hague Treaties. This he did in February, 1915, before the *Lusitania* sinking had caused the *Tribune* to regard a break with Germany as right and inevitable.

As the paper's campaign for nationalism and preparedness progressed, it found Roosevelt's ideas ever more in harmony with its principles. Roosevelt attacked pacifism, accused Wilson of denying Americans the protection he should have accorded them on the high seas and in Mexico, called for a war of righteousness. Roosevelt favored conscription, or at least a large increase in our standing army. In fine, any reader of Roosevelt's book, *Fear God And Take Your Own Part*, which was compiled from his writings in the *Metropolitan Magazine* and elsewhere during 1915 and 1916, will find there a close similarity to the main points of the *Tribune's* stand for the revitalization of America.

In spite of this spiritual kinship, it was difficult for the *Tribune* to accept Roosevelt as its candidate for the Presidency. The year 1912 was not forgotten, nor was the breach in the party yet healed. The paper praised Roosevelt's emphatic labor for the cause highly, and rumors circulated that it would swing over to the Progressives. In January, 1916, these whispers became so loud that the *Tribune* publicly denied their truth. In this statement the paper asserted that Elihu Root or Charles Evans Hughes would be more acceptable as candidates had they spoken with the clear voice of Roosevelt. The paper reaffirmed its loyalty to the Republican Party, but added significantly that it was not willing "to accept from Republicans what it has denounced in a Democrat."

In February, Root, by a strong speech along the lines of the *Tribune's* program, caused a momentary boom of the strong nationalists in his behalf. But he was unacceptable to the Progressives.⁵ Hughes remained wrapt in the close mantle of his judicial dignity. The Progressives, especially their leader, were coming into ever closer liaison with the elder party. Then in March, Senator Warren G. Harding, as spokesman for the Old Guard, declared that the tariff would be the dominant issue in the coming campaign. The *Tribune* rejected this idea with scorn and determined to do its utmost to force a clear-cut statement of principles upon the Republican Party. On the day following the report of Harding's state-

ment, the *Tribune* came out for "Colonel Roosevelt and no 'pussey-footing.' "

In explaining its stand, the paper expressed again its regret at the objections to Root's candidacy and its hope that he would be Secretary of State in the new Administration. It also deplored Hughes's silence; were he to speak now he could do no more than "take the torch that Colonel Roosevelt has thus far borne." Therefore:

We are for Roosevelt in spite of the fact that we were against him four years ago. No one fought him harder than we. No one will fight harder for him. It has not been easy to put aside our pride, our sense of resentment at what occurred in 1912, and the hundred other things that tend to keep alive divisions. But we have put them aside and we are putting them aside because we feel that they have no place in a crisis like this. . . .

We are for Colonel Roosevelt because we feel the country needs him. No one else will quicken the pulse of the nation as he will quicken it. No one else will stir the conscience of the people as he will stir it. No one else will inspire patriotism as he will inspire it.

No one else personifies the issue which the Republican party must make as he personifies it. No one else represents so effective an antithesis to Wilson as he. If we are Americans, real Americans, the Colonel is our man.

In supporting Roosevelt, the *Tribune* denied that it was deserting the party. It sought to regraft strength on the old Republican tree from its most vigorous offshoot. But to accept the Colonel and the issue which he represented required more courage than the Republican Party possessed. Both were packed with dynamite. Wilson had come under fire from two sides at once. Root, Roosevelt and the *Tribune* thought him culpably weak in his treatment of Germany. On the other hand, the Irish, the Hearst papers and many German-American Republicans considered the President as pro-English, because of the tenor of his notes to Germany and his failure to exact literal compliance with international law on the part of Great Britain. To nominate a representative of the first group would alienate the second completely, as well as that great mass of indeterminates who had a sentimental enthusiasm for the Entente but did not propose to fight for it.

The Republican chieftains, therefore, veered more and more in

the direction of Justice Hughes, who, to an impeccable record of public service, added the quality of absolute silence on the subject of foreign affairs. Seeing this drift, the *Tribune* asked: "Are the people of this country to be compelled to choose between a candidate who was 'too proud to fight' and one who was too proud to speak?" Instead of a statement from Hughes, the answer was an alarming move on the part of a group of German editors, who approached Chairman Hilles of the Republican National Committee and informed him that the voters they represented would not support Roosevelt or Root, but would accept "Hughes or any favorite son." The *Tribune* took fire immediately. A cartoon was published showing a phalanx of stout men, wearing *pickelhauben* over unmistakably Teutonic countenances, marching "Nach Chicago!" with a portrait of Hughes. This was accompanied by an editorial pronouncement that:

The *Tribune* does not believe that Mr. Hughes sympathizes with the Hyphens or with Hyphenism. But the German-Americans have adopted him as their candidate.

As Hughes maintained his decorous and politic silence, the paper added a solemn warning:

If the Republican National Convention accepts the German-American candidate and Mr. Hughes consents to be the German-American candidate even for purposes of obtaining the Republican nomination, Woodrow Wilson will be reelected.

In face of this prophecy, Hughes was nominated, without breaking his judicial (and judicious) tactiturnity. The *Tribune* was forced to a decision. Lugubriously it fell in line.

The *Tribune* will loyally support Charles E. Hughes. From the morning of the *Lusitania* to the present hour, this newspaper has fought for certain vital principles which it believed to be vital in American life.

For many weeks it has advocated the nomination of the American who championed these principles most fearlessly and uncompromisingly.

The man has been defeated, the principles are not included in the Republican platform, and they will not be found in the statement issued by Mr. Hughes after nomination. Insofar, then, as these principles are concerned, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Wilson stand on the same ground, as yet.

But the *Tribune* purposes to support Mr. Hughes because it believes

that in all other respects Mr. Hughes is the stronger man and will make a better President.

It gave the editors no great pleasure to have the Democratic *World* point out that Hughes's nomination was really a compliment to Wilson because of the similarity between the two men, and to be taunted with the remark that the Republicans were afraid to nominate a man with a record of opposition to the President. The *Tribune* tried to put the best face possible on the matter, and almost pathetically urged Hughes to declare himself, but fully aware that they had only a Tweedledum to oppose the Tweedledee in office, the Republican campaign was rather invertebrate.

The only issue that gave any promise of vitality was Wilson's championship of the Adamson Act, granting an eight-hour day to railroad employees. Hughes and the *Tribune* made the most of this surrender to the threat of a strike, but, with all minds centered on the war, it fell rather flat. The *Tribune* tried to revive the Nationalism issue and to invest Hughes with some shreds, at least, of the garments of Roosevelt. On September 15, the paper reasserted:

Nationalism is the real issue of the Presidential campaign. The creation of a genuine national spirit, of a habit of mind which will instinctively subordinate local, sectional, racial, class or individual interests to the interests of the nation as a whole, is the greatest task now confronting the people of the United States.

And, continued the editorial, Hughes "stands more courageously and vigorously than his opponent has stood or ever will stand, for a complete and aggressive nationalism." But this was rather difficult to prove. Furthermore, Wilson could point to the practical success of his policy, for there had been no submarine outrages since the German note of May, 1916, and the slogan "He kept us out of war" operated powerfully in his favor. Still, the fight was remarkably close, so close that Democrats have claimed Potsdam poured in its gold to elect Hughes.⁶ Maine was carried by the Republicans and the *Tribune* asserted confidently that the party, "Reunited and Invincible," would win.

Election Day came, and the early returns were very satisfactory. The *Tribune* had arranged to send light signals from the Woolworth Tower to record the progress of the balloting, and

crowds milling about New York after 7:29 that night saw the "steady white searchlight ray" which announced Hughes's victory. The candidate went to bed rather early and his son greeted the reporters with the confident phrase, "The President has retired." The *Tribune* also "went to bed" earlier than is its habit at present; for a reporter, who picked up a rumor at three in the morning and immediately dashed for a 'phone, found no one to receive his news but a scrubwoman.⁷

The *Tribune* came out next morning with the proud statement that:

Mr. Wilson has been answered; the election returns are a demonstration to the whole world that not yet are Americans too proud to fight for their honor or too cowardly to defend their women and children.

But the news which Robert Benchley had tried to get to the office was to the effect that California, under the leadership of its unreconstructed Progressive, Hiram Johnson, was off the reservation and that Wilson was probably the winner. Two days later, when the truth of this rumor was established, the *Tribune* printed its anticlimactic "Real Answer," acknowledging that Wilson had received "the most remarkable personal indorsement that has come to a Democratic President since the days of Andrew Jackson." The paper credited the Republican defeat to Hughes's "personal failure as a candidate" and his "resolute refusal to meet the great question of the campaign fairly and bravely." In other words, Wilson was "as much stronger than his party as Hughes was weaker than his."

With the reelection of Wilson, the *Tribune* became almost resigned to the role which America apparently was content to play in the battle of the nations. But fate and the Imperial German Government intervened, and the dawn of 1917 saw renewal of unrestricted submarine warfare. The paper saw in this a fulfillment of all its teaching anent the folly of defense by proclamation, and called for instant action. This time it was forthcoming. Without waiting for an overt act to follow the German threat, Wilson handed von Bernstorff his passports. The *Tribune* applauded. But instead of passing instantly to war, the country entered what the *Tribune* called "the twilight zone" of armed neutrality. Even

this, a policy which the paper dubbed a "blunder and a fizzle," was only achieved after a long siege in the Senate, which set the *Tribune* deliberating gravely on the degeneracy of the West.

When the President, after a filibuster had made Senate action impossible, armed the merchantmen by his executive authority, the *Tribune* consoled itself with the thought that such a step must inevitably lead to real war whenever a ship so armed met its U-boat, and that Congress could only ratify the existing state of affairs.

When Congress assembles it cannot honorably or wisely refrain from a declaration which, by that time, will obviously mean only describing what is actually going on.

But the paper could find little of that high purpose which it had so long advocated in this approach to war, so like a man trying out the water of his bath with a toe and only immersing when he slips. "We are going to war with Germany ultimately, exactly as the people of a native village will ultimately go out and kill a tiger. . . . We have sacrificed the opportunity of going to war for a principle."

Disgruntled by the circumstances of our entrance, the *Tribune* still did its utmost to expedite the matter, calling on the Republicans to offer no resistance to the Democratic organization of Congress so that the President could present his war message the more speedily. It came at last and the *Tribune* greeted it as "one of the great documents of history, reëchoing in a new and yet in the original spirit those words of Lincoln, 'With malice to none.' "

Congress decided for war on April 6, and the *Tribune's* wish was fulfilled, though tardily, it is true. The Crusaders were embarked.

CHAPTER XVI

WAR

WITH the goal it had set on May 8, 1915, at last achieved, the *Tribune* now turned to the task of fusing the nation's strength for the great effort. On April 16 the paper announced its formula for a fighting democracy, a difficult ideal, and one which was capable of many divergent interpretations:

We must socialize for military advantage the entire strength of the nation, yet without sacrificing the spirit of democracy. We must present to the enemy an absolutely united front, yet without surrendering the independence of personal judgment.

The only flaw in this program was that its terms implied a contradiction; in effect it stated that the people must be at liberty to think, but must think alike. Human nature being somewhat cantankerous in this respect, the tension 'twixt authority and free will led to considerable friction, and, in the *Tribune's* case, to one of the stormiest periods of its career.

One of the first problems facing the country was the nature and extent of its participation in the combat. It would seem self-evident that the only way to wage war is to fight one's opponent; but in the situation of 1917 there were practical difficulties. Unless we threw in our lot with the other enemies of Germany, our hostile contact with that power would be limited to submarine hunting off the coast. A not inconsiderable section of opinion in the United States mistrusted the Entente and saw no kinship between this country and the European opponents of the Central Powers, save an accidental alignment against a common foe. This group proposed a purely defensive war. The *Tribune*, of course, had long felt that the Allies were fighting our own battle, that while the immediate cause of this country's entrance into the war was resistance to "the assertion and application by Germany of the doctrine that American citizens may be murdered and American

ships sunk whenever German purpose is thus served," the basic cause was shared in common with England and France—namely, opposition to the Teutonic "assault on democracy and humanity," of which Belgium was the symbol. Hence, said the *Tribune*:

Our voice for right and justice should be spoken at the council table of the democratic nations of the world and it should be the voice of an equal partner in the great undertaking which Mr. Wilson has described for his country and for the world in a message which will remain forever memorable.

This policy of coöperation seemed the only practical way of securing the defeat of Germany, although the Hearst papers continued to warn that "stripping our country of men, money and food is a dangerous policy," and claimed instead, as late as May 17, that

The only correct strategy is to spend all our money and all our labor in preparing our navy and our armies HERE AT THEIR NATURAL BASE and so compelling Germany, if she wants to fight, to come to us and see how she likes the taste of OUR GRANITE.

But other papers, less strictly isolationist, were compelled to admit the cogency of the policy of coöperation. The *World*, for instance, which had asserted in 1915 that if we entered the war we would do it "in our own name, under our own colors and with our own arms," and not "for Britain, for France or for Russia," now conceded that to join with the Allies was the only policy "which recognizes the facts as they are." The principle of equal partnership was thus soon established.

The policy fixed, the method remained to be debated. The most immediate means of assisting those nations already at the front was naturally to relieve their financial strain. In view of the importance of the war debt controversy at the present time, it is interesting to note both the *World* and the *Tribune* advocating that this assistance be made in the form of a gift rather than as a loan. At the time, however, this detail did not assume the proportions which it took on later. The real contests occurred over the military assistance. On the larger question, the method of raising a force for effective service overseas, the *Tribune's* attitude has

been indicated in a previous chapter. Conscription, and not "the blundering volunteer system," insisted the paper, should be the chief reliance of the country. The long campaign of education in preparedness had its effect in this emergency, and the *Tribune's* plea did not fall on deaf ears. But conscription, thanks to our unready years, would not permit the transport of fighting men to France within a year. The morale of France and Great Britain was succumbing to war-weariness; a more immediate transfusion of fresh blood was necessary to restore their waning vitality.

The project of sending a division to Europe as soon as possible was agitated in the *Tribune* even before our declaration of war. The arguments against such action were weighty. The tiny Regular Army was highly necessary in this country to serve as *cadres* for a new army, and any diminution of this nucleus would impair the efficiency of the major force. A hastily raised and transported force of volunteers, on the other hand, might destroy whatever respect their presence could inspire, convincing the Allies, by lack of discipline and training, that the prevailing conception of America as amateurish in military affairs was well grounded.

Recognizing the strength of these arguments, the *Tribune* still argued that the effect of a tangible evidence of American assistance would outweigh the opposing considerations. This first expeditionary force, said the *Tribune* on March 21, should be composed of one division, twenty thousand men, officered by Regulars and completely equipped. It should take its stand by the side of the Belgian army, in token of Belgium's position as the "sign and symbol" of the common cause.

The press of the country soon joined the *Tribune* in its demand for the dispatch of such a force as the paper had outlined, and the clamor was heightened by a plea to the same effect from General Joffre, head of the French mission to this country. The General Staff, apparently out of lack of sympathy for the project, unwisely censored the General's statement on the subject, which, when the facts became known, only added to the storm in the press. The plan had every chance of succeeding, due to the sheer pressure of public opinion. But the situation was complicated by the irrepressible Theodore Roosevelt.

Roosevelt had been among the first to propose sending an ad-

vance guard to France; indeed, the *Tribune's* editorial of March 21 was probably directly inspired by a speech which Roosevelt delivered the day before. Unfortunately, Roosevelt was not content to foster the idea as an academic proposition. On the contrary, he ardently desired a command and besieged Baker and Wilson with pleas for a commission. As proof of military ability he instanced the losses suffered by the Rough Riders in Cuba—truly an extraordinary recommendation—his brevet rank as brigade commander at Santiago, and even the fact that as a former Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy he was eligible to any post in those services. He set about organizing his command in advance of authorization, secured adhesions, and on May 7 claimed that the roster of his hypothetical force had reached 180,000 men, outdistancing the combined recruitments of the Regular Army and Navy. Many journals took up his case and it received further impetus from a letter written by Clemenceau to Wilson, urging Roosevelt's appointment for its beneficial effect on the morale of the Allied troops, to whom Roosevelt's prowess took on epic proportions. Wilson, who had determined that this would be a professional war, free from the political absurdities which had featured the higher command of our earlier armies, referred the matter of the General Staff, which refused the request.

In the midst of this tumult, the *Tribune's* position was rather embarrassing. A warm supporter of the expeditionary force idea, as well as of Roosevelt personally, the paper was too firm in its opposition to a haphazard conduct of the war on a volunteer basis to be able with consistency to promote the Colonel's ambition. Perhaps the editor visualized the flood of requests which would pour in upon the War Department if Roosevelt were given a command, and the difficulty of justifying refusal. At any rate, the paper compromised. "The Roosevelt Divisions" received ample publicity in the news columns and "Letters to the Editor" in support thereof were prominently displayed—one, in fact, comparing Roosevelt to Garibaldi and Wilson to Cavour from the pen of Cavour's biographer, W. R. Thayer, was featured at the head of the first editorial column. But the editors who voiced the policy of the paper remained silent.

The affair was noisy enough to delay action on the conscription

for some time, a fact upon which the *Tribune* commented obliquely somewhat later, and Congress was finally forced to make contingent provision for such a force as Roosevelt proposed, leaving the decision as to its employment to the President. Wilson stuck to his guns and refused Roosevelt's proffered service, thereby ensuring the latter's enmity, but acceded to the almost universal demand for "first aid" to France by ordering General Pershing and the First Division of the Regular Army overseas. The *Tribune* cordially endorsed this move.

From this gradual accession to all of the *Tribune's* ideas as to the manner in which the war should be conducted, it might be assumed that the paper was satisfied with the course of events. But such was not the case. During these first months of the war, a steady stream of criticism issued from the Tall Tower. The *Tribune* had no intention of slavishly following the Administration, or of "surrendering the independence of personal judgment." On the contrary, the utility of free criticism as a means of securing the utmost efficiency was a cardinal tenet of the *Tribune* policy, and remained one of the most striking features of its service in the war.

The background of the assertion of the vital need for critical discussion of measures of government in wartime lay in the careers of the Allies, and has been indicated in the previous chapter. The relative effectiveness of England's ostrich optimism and of the grim willingness of France to face facts taught a lesson which the *Tribune* would not have this country ignore. As America inclines to the English rather than the French habit of mind, the *Tribune's* insistence on fact-facing was not always taken in good part and was regarded by the Democrats as partizan querulousness. But the consistency with which the *Tribune* had urged this attitude upon its own party as well as upon the dominant Democrats seems to indicate that, on the whole, with such reservations as are inevitable under our party system, the paper was influenced far more by ideals of national life than by factionalism.

The fight for liberty of comment began with the outbreak of war. An Espionage Bill was introduced into Congress with a section providing for censorship of the press. This was universally condemned. The *Tribune* urged that the papers be permitted to

become their own censors. The Government could draw up rules whereby the editors might know which type of information might furnish information to the enemy. Any infraction of these rules could, of course, be dealt with under the general provisions of the Espionage Act. But the chief danger to freedom of speech would be obviated; no body of officials created by the Administration would have the power to gag opponents of that authority in office. For, continued the *Tribune*:

Free speech was never more needed than it is today. To sacrifice it would merely be to intrench incompetency in office in a crisis in which the nation cannot afford to condone or tolerate incompetency.

In the face of the practically unanimous opposition of the press, Congress declined to give the Committee of Public Information the power of censorship which the Administration desired. George Creel, chairman of the committee, issued a pamphlet of voluntary censorship regulations, as the *Tribune* had suggested. But the paper, like most other members of the press, found these regulations extremely onerous and refused to consent to some of the provisions, since they could not do so "without," as the *Tribune* said, "submitting to a dictatorship more fantastic and oppressive than exists in any other nation now at war."

The *Tribune* was the more anxious to maintain its freedom of comment, since it found so much in the early conduct of the war to criticize. The first month after the declaration of war found, said the *Tribune* in a devastating editorial, "chaos and worse than chaos." In a similar period, the Germans had raised 1,500,000 men, had swept through Belgium and Northern France and were almost at the gates of Paris. The British mobilized the greatest navy in the world and had sent an army "larger than our whole available field force" to fight beside the French. The latter had summoned more than a million men to the colors, and were on the verge of delivering "that great final counter offensive" which "saved Europe and Civilization from German barbarism."

What in this time have we done? Does anyone know? Congress has considered the conscription bill and the two houses are deadlocked over its provisions at the end of the first month of the war. The Naval Advisory Board has informed the country that it has solved the sub-

marine menace with a pencil and a sheet of paper and then revised its judgment and asked leave to report again, in the future. By the volunteering system the army has raised 50,000 men, the navy 40,000.

The General Staff has considered the project of sending an army to France and decided to send nine regiments of engineers when and if they can be raised. One gun crew of an American armed merchantman reports that it has sunk a German submarine; the German submarines have sunk two American merchantmen.

Now, laying aside what has been done by Congress in the way of making appropriations and loans and other dispositions of money that could be attended to by resolution, here is an interesting measure of the chief accomplishments of a month of war.

This effective parallelism was particularly interesting in view of the *Tribune's* gloomy picture of the situation abroad. Under the heading "The Brutal Truth," the *Tribune* tried to arouse the country into effective action. The food situation in England, said this editorial anxiously, is serious, and must be relieved by America as soon as possible; the French morale is cracking and must be bolstered speedily by assistance from this country, or our prospective army would have no battle line to support.

What was the cause of this initial inertia? The *Tribune* set itself to inquire, but the answer was not readily discovered. A member of the editorial staff went to Washington and reported that the government seemed to fear to assume the risks of active criticism. Members of the Administration blamed Congress, and Congress blamed the President. Roosevelt was accused of delaying action by his military ambitions, and Attorney General Gregory was roundly scored for his ill-advised censorship clause which only further muddled the waters of counsel. The exact reason for the general slackness which the paper, in its impatience, ascribed to America was almost impossible to discern.

The *Tribune* was not inclined to lay it on the shoulders of Wilson at this time. Wilson, in fact, was enjoying the smiles of the *Tribune* to a very considerable extent in these days, thanks to his firm attitude in the early months of 1917, and the paper rejoiced in his conversion "from pacifist to warrior," as well as in the diminishing "transcendentalism" and increasing realism of his speeches. But Clinton Gilbert, who was now embarked on his career as critic of the Washington scene, hinted that the Presi-

dent's party was the real stumbling block in the American war-path. There is a peace party in Congress, said Gilbert, and it is not the Republican Party. Gilbert claimed that if the President would really attempt to align the Republicans with his own following, the work of Congress would be greatly expedited. Here we see the beginnings of that attack on the President's failure to induce the coöperation of the Republican Congressmen which was to grow to sizable proportions in the next session of Congress, become a tempest in the campaign of 1918, and finally play no small part in wrecking the Treaty of Versailles. But in July, 1917, it was just a gentle rebuke.

The passage of the Selective Service Act, the dispatch of troops to France, the authorization of an ambitious aviation program, the appointment of Hoover as Food Commissioner, and the commencement of intensive ship construction gave an earnest of America's determination to be a real factor in the war. The sharp edge of criticism was withheld, then, while the country waited for performance to follow. This expectant period lasted until December, 1917, when there was a mighty outburst of censure, reflecting general disappointment at the result of the efforts of the administrative branch of the government to meet the burdens imposed upon it.

In the meanwhile, the *Tribune's* lively interest in maintaining national efficiency had a most beneficial effect upon the paper from a journalistic standpoint. In the previous chapter mention was made of the dependence placed upon the Associated Press for war news after 1914. The two years which followed were notable rather for the excellence of the editorial page than for reportorial activity. It was a period when the chief emphasis was placed upon driving home a message rather than on newsgathering. This condition was not peculiar to the *Tribune*. The intense interest which the American people took in the controversial issues of 1915 and 1916 marked a return in importance for the editorial page throughout the country.

It must not be supposed from the foregoing that the *Tribune's* newsgathering had been totally neglected. It was during 1915 and 1916 that Arthur Draper, who went to London after the sinking of the *Lusitania* and remained to become chief of the

Tribune's European Service, laid the foundations of a fine reputation by his temperate and informative articles, and the local news was adequately covered as usual in the paper. Nevertheless, it was with America's entrance into the war that the *Tribune* really began to recover the reputation for authoritative and skillful correspondence from the centers of interest which it had previously possessed, and of which it is so justly proud today.

One of the means by which the *Tribune* gave the stamp of authority to its articles was the "Editorial Correspondence," in which several of the best pens in the editorial room were set to the work of reporting the war on the home front. Clinton Gilbert wrote his first Washington correspondence under this head, and Garet Garrett, the managing editor and financial expert, contributed an illuminating series of articles. Gilbert remained in Washington, apparently finding there the true field for his highly developed critical faculty, and was later succeeded by Carter Field. Theodore M. Knappen served as liaison officer, with the labor battalions, reporting the progress of industry during the war. William McPherson commented particularly on military affairs and Arthur Gleason wrote at large.

Another special aspect of journalism which took on new life after our declaration of war was war correspondence from the field. The American reading public might take a somewhat academic interest in daily reports from Champagne and Flanders when "foreigners" were expending themselves madly for the gain of a few kilometers, which barely shifted the flags on a war map, but it developed an immediate personal interest when American troops joined the game. It therefore behooved a good newspaper to satisfy that interest. When Pershing sailed with the first contingent, the *Tribune* abstracted Heywood Broun from the Committee of Public Information, where he was temporarily serving, and sent him abroad to record the life of the first Americans on the scene of action, and the accumulation of the American Expeditionary Force.

While mobilizing its forces of inquiry and awaiting the tangible results of the huge program upon which the country embarked in the spring and summer of 1917, the *Tribune* turned its attention to the extirpation of heresy within the land. Its efforts in that

direction, which ultimately led to a savage newspaper fight, were an interesting corollary to the principle of the "independence of private judgment." The *Tribune* made a sharp distinction between discussion which was intended to produce more efficiency in the carrying on of war and comment which tended or was designed to oppose that end. For example, the paper did not hesitate to suggest that some provisions of the draft law, as passed, were inequitable; but it sharply condemned any attempt to interfere with the operation of the law. Opposing a board of censors, it yet advocated that such publications as *The Masses* be dealt with by courts-martial. The precise difference in effect between criticism which may secure more effective action, but in so doing tends to weaken faith in the nation's leaders, and censure which is directly and disloyally aimed to produce that end, is apt to be a bit subtle in practice. In fact, the *Tribune* incurred administrative displeasure on that account; but this did not prevent the paper from doing its utmost to regiment the public mind to the larger issues of the war, "to present to the enemy an absolutely united front."

Upon its entrance into the war, the United States was afflicted with a bad case of nerves over the existence of a large German-speaking population which, it was suspected, could not sympathize with the country in battle. This attitude had been fostered by the noisy activities of such groups as the German-American Alliance during the period of neutrality, as well as by the espionage and sabotage attributed to German agents, which the exposure of Dumba and von Papen had revealed. Hyphenism played an important role in the campaign of 1916, as we have seen; and, when war finally came, the governor of Connecticut solemnly warned his legislature that armed bands had been seen drilling in lonely places and an uprising was expected at almost any moment.

The *Tribune* was prominent in urging the suppression of many forms of Teutonic "propaganda"—such as the German language press, German societies, and the German influence in the schools; but it is to the paper's credit that it was reluctant to join in that crusade against German music which formed the most asinine manifestation of narrow patriotism during the war. The influence of Henry Krehbiel may have had some part in determining the

paper's attitude in this matter.

It was soon shown that the German-American groups were not the menace which the country had feared they might prove, and the *Tribune* turned its guns on those groups of radicals to whom resistance to war was a principle and not a matter of racial sympathy.

In this phase of the work, a new factor entered the picture.¹ William H. Lamar was solicitor of the Post Office Department. He approached Garet Garrett with the suggestion that the *Tribune* coöperate with the government in an attempt to secure convictions for those who gave vent, in print, to seditious utterances. The government wanted an informed and favorable public opinion, and Lamar felt that the *Tribune* was in a particularly good position to educate the public on the issues involved.

Naturally, there was some hesitance on the part of the *Tribune's* manager. It meant the revival of the old type of newspaper war, with weapons that the government would supply, but which it was sure to disavow if publicly challenged. Nevertheless, Garrett agreed, on the understanding that the paper's exposures were to be followed by government action. Fred Pitney went to Washington, where the files of the Post Office Department were put at his disposal.

The first series of articles was entitled "Enemies Within" and discussed the shortcomings of such men as the elder Robert La Follette, Max Eastman and Samuel Cahan. Pitney's series was followed, in September, 1917, by another under the heading "Who's Who Against America." The first of the new series was written by Samuel Hopkins Adams, and William Randolph Hearst was the target.

Hearst's policy since 1914 would seem to have been consistently and narrowly nationalist. His biographer, Winkler, has asserted "Amid all the camouflage, amid all the inconsistencies, the publisher had one definite aim: to keep America's men, munitions, money out of the war."² If this was his real purpose, it was naturally liable to misconstruction. During the years of American neutrality, Hearst assailed Germany on occasion, it is true, but he also apologized for her acts and vehemently attacked Great Britain and Japan. Such tactics caused Hearst to be suspected of

pro-German tendencies, and his news service was barred from England and France in 1916 for alleged garbling of dispatches in the German interest. This was followed by the action of the Canadian Government, which put Hearst's publications under the ban in the Dominion.³

Even after the United States entered the war, Hearst continued his fight to keep the country out of as much of the actual conflict as possible, leading in the abortive movement to restrict our share in the war to home defense. This course, though accompanied by a star-spangled fury of red, white and blue heads and other typographical exhibitions of patriotism, soon proved not only ineffectual but perilous, and "rather than attempt futile martyrdom, he faced about and effectively aided the overwhelming mobilization of America's resources. . . ." ⁴ The *Tribune* regarded this conversion as hypocritical and, although it drew the major share of the ammunition against Hearst from the utterances of his press prior to July, 1917, the paper considered him potentially dangerous.

In the meanwhile the country began to grow curious about the results of the huge program upon which the Legislature had so doughtily embarked in our first three months of war. Suspicions began to dawn that all was not well. This sentiment came to a head with the meeting of Congress in December, 1917. Upon motions of Senators Wadsworth and Lodge, Republicans, the upper house ordered investigations into the conduct of the War Department and of the Fuel Administration. Certainly, a part of the animus of these proceedings may be attributed to the conviction of the Republican group in the Senate that it was being slighted by the Wilson Administration in the conduct of the war.

The *Tribune's* attitude for several months past had been one of expectancy. Certain details of policy and administration were criticized—for instance, the paper held that the system of apportionment under the Selective Service Act unduly favored the South and rural sections as against the Northeast and the cities. But there had been no general censure of the manner in which the war was being fought. Under the stimulus of the Congressional investigation, however, the *Tribune* began to make inquiries of its own.

On January 13, 1918, the paper began to run a series of articles by Caspar Whitney on the conditions of the American troops in France. From studies made on the spot, and with a background of experience in Belgian relief, Mr. Whitney asserted that the service of supply to the A.E.F. had failed in many vital particulars, and the soldiers were dependent upon the French for much of their equipment. Further, the American army was detained too long in training behind the lines and was therefore as yet of little assistance to our Allies. On January 22 a dispatch from Arthur Draper in London was prominently displayed, which set forth the disappointment felt by many British and French experts at the efforts put forth by America. The policy of retaining the American troops in training areas until sufficiently numerous for decisive action as a unit, instead of employing them as immediate replacements for the weary Allied soldiers, was not approved. But even more criticism was expressed at the comparative failure of America to give immediate aid in food, munitions and material. This, warned Draper, was regarded by the Allied authorities as particularly dangerous in view of the approaching German "initiative" which was expected to follow the release of German troops from the collapsed Eastern Front, and which indeed proved nearly disastrous a few months later.

On the same day, January 22, an editorial summed up the *Tribune's* complaint against the Administration. The United States had indeed raised an army of 1,500,000 men in the ten months we had been at war, but of that number 1,200,000 were still in training camps—many without rifles and lacking machine guns. The shipbuilding program was hardly under way. The railway system had broken down. There was a shortage of labor and coal. A nation of a hundred millions was "baffled and impotent." What was the reason? At this time the *Tribune* was still very tender with Wilson, whose prestige had been enormously increased by his formulation of the Fourteen Points on January 7. The editorial said "we are proud of our high-minded spokesman," but went on to lay the blame for the nation's "failure" upon Wilson's distrust of Big Business and his consequent failure to employ its executive talents to best advantage. With pointed reference to Baker and Daniels, the editorial continued, "We do not want, for

the successful conduct of the war, politicians or lawyers or, without disrespect, country editors." Instead, the *Tribune* proposed a War Council in which the best business brains of the country could really extend themselves.

Senator George E. Chamberlain of Oregon, a Democrat, had suggested a war cabinet in a speech on January 18. The *Tribune* proceeded to develop the plan in a series of signed articles by its managing editor, Garet Garrett, which were masterpieces of clarity and finesse. Garrett attributed the breakdown of America's production schedule to the fact that the President had been loaded with responsibilities beyond the point where it was possible for him to give efficient personal service. He illustrated this point with diagrams to show all the boards and committees which were directly under the Chief Executive. Then Garrett went on to explain that the best solution was to have, in effect, two cabinets: one the existing body, functioning on a peacetime basis, and, entirely separate from the old organization, a War Council which would take all of the increased duties stemming from the war. Both groups would be appointed by the President and responsible to him, but the War Council would act as shock absorber between Wilson and the new boards and functionaries who were spreading like rabbits through the Administration. The chief difference between this War Council and the existing Council of National Defense would be an increased responsibility and complete divorcement from the Cabinet. The division of labor proposed in the new plan, asserted Garrett, would permit the President to assume more fully his duties as moral leader of the nation.

Although very plausibly stated and, in the *Tribune's* case at least, urged with great deference to Wilson and even to his associates, this plan had much the appearance of substituting a set of administrative officers for those in power. At any rate, Wilson regarded the project as an attempted vote of censure. In its place he proposed to Congress that a measure be passed which would give him the power to "make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or

officer in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this act." In other words, instead of accepting any division of responsibility, Wilson proposed to take upon himself even more than he had already assumed, and to strike at inefficiency in person.

This measure, implying, as the *Tribune* viewed it, rejection of the proffered aid of the Republicans and an intensified contraction of power in the hands of the President, caused the paper to drop the respectful attitude it had hitherto maintained toward the President. While urging that the bill be passed, the *Tribune* took a sort of "let him have it and be damned to him" air, which was soon to pass into active hostility. The paper said, in effect: Wilson has claimed that his lack of power to effect a reorganization in his own way and on his own responsibility has hampered administrative efficiency. "Inability to make such a reorganization has been set up as an alibi for shortcomings in performance." Therefore, although Lincoln and Stanton did not require such an extraordinary grant of power, and although the real defect may be a "lack of latent energy," the alibi should at least be quashed.

In the meanwhile, as has been said, the *Tribune* had sent Heywood Broun to France in July, 1917, as correspondent with the A.E.F. This organization was not a particularly fertile field for news in the first year of its existence, and Broun was confined to describing the reactions of the French to baseball terms and the like. This made amusing but not very exciting copy, and, moreover, Broun was irked by the restrictions of the censor. He did manage to convey the idea that American soldiers were not demi-gods in tin hats, a fact which the *Tribune's* policy of realism gave considerable prominence; but on the whole his efforts were not startlingly successful and, in January, 1918, he was recalled. Wilbur Forrest, European manager of the United Press, took his place, serving with great distinction throughout the war. Forrest had adapted himself thoroughly to the new conditions of war correspondence. The man at the front was not in a position to judge the changing state of the war map except within a very limited range. Forrest, therefore, proceeded to exploit the "human interest" element in warfare. He would dispute the adjective "fearless" as applied to himself, since that to him connotes a form

of stupidity. But though fully alive to the discomforts and dangers to be encountered, he was in the front lines whenever possible, going forward with the attack and sharing all the sensations of the men who did the fighting.

While in France, Heywood Broun had become convinced that things were badly managed, and it was the opinion of many with whom he conversed, officers and fellow correspondents, that the country should be informed of this condition. He returned in the midst of the storm of criticism evoked by the Congressional investigation of the War Department and, believing himself free of the rigorous censorship of the army area, joined in the *Tribune's* campaign of exposure. Most of his work in this connection was not statistical; it lacked, for example, the thoroughgoing quality of Whitney's articles on the same theme. Instead, Broun confined himself to short anecdotes which were usually featured, boxed, on one of the inside pages of the paper. But his stories were funny; they played up to the ridiculous side of the War Department's little errors, and brass hats are extremely susceptible to ridicule. They were on the alert to catch Broun slipping.

On March 16, Broun published, in all good faith, the following little tale:

Decoded

On the eve of the ship's departure from New York for a foreign port the War Department suddenly realized that it had assigned eighteen major generals to the same ship. A readjustment was made so that only five went to the boat.

"But," said the man who told the story, "that wasn't the funniest part of it. Code messages were sent to each of the major generals ordering him to be ready to start for overseas service on a specified date, and twelve of the eighteen replied over the open wire in unadorned English, 'I will be ready to sail for France on —' and added the date mentioned in the code message."

In this case, Broun had been a bit too credulous and retribution for *lèse majesté* was swift. War correspondents in the army area were bonded by their papers and, although Broun was now in the United States, the government declared his bond forfeited.

The *Tribune's* penalty was levied at a time when an amendment to the sedition act was contemplated and when, therefore,

the status of wartime newspaper criticism was a subject of much debate. Some periodicals had already been denied second-class mailing privileges. But Hearst, whom the *Tribune* regarded as a subtle and extremely powerful influence, had not only been exempt from hostile activity on the part of the government but had actually been assisted in regaining permission to operate his news service in England and France. Gareth Garrett felt that this was contrary to the understanding on which the *Tribune* had conducted its campaign against sedition, and he set himself to force the Administration's hand.

The *Tribune* had kept up an intermittent fire at Hearst since Adams's articles of the preceding September. On April 23, 1918, the attacks were organized into a daily column headed, "Coiled in the Flag, Hear-s-s-s-t," conducted by Kenneth MacGowan. On weekdays this column was usually composed of excerpts from the Hearst publications; on Sundays this material was expanded into double-page interpretative articles with facsimiles of cartoons and headlines, decorated by an allegorical cut of a serpent entwined in the American flag. The general line of the *Tribune's* charges has already been indicated. Not much new evidence was adduced but the material was arrayed in such fashion as to indicate that Hearst had attempted to delay our entrance into the war—which was true—because of sympathy with Germany—which was probably wrong. Among the charges was that Hearst had obstructed the draft by the publication, on June 29, 1917, of an editorial which praised the general principle of the Selective Service Act, but went on to say:

These papers have said consistently, and will continue to maintain, that the American soldiers who go to France should go as volunteers and not as conscripted men, sent by the will of the Government.

Another bit of evidence was rather comic. In printing Wilson's Thanksgiving Proclamation, a subordinate editor on the *American* had ordered it set in larger type for two late editions. In so doing, a clause praying for victory had been omitted. The *Tribune* pounced on this deletion as another evidence of pro-German sentiment, wringing this editorial exclamation from the *American*:

We must confess that the most diabolical ingenuity could not have selected lines to cut out which could have caused more editorial dismay and more heartfelt profanity than did the perverse stupidity of this particular sub-editor.

The *Tribune's* summation of the Hearst offenses follows:

Since the United States entered the war the Hearst papers have printed: 74 attacks on our allies, 17 instances of defense or praise of Germany, 63 pieces of anti-war propaganda, 1 deletion of a Presidential proclamation—total 155—or an average of nearly three a week, while America has been engaged in the life and death struggle with civilization's enemy.

The *Tribune* asserted that this proved the Hearst newspapers "disloyal and dangerous," and that suppression by the Federal authorities would be the "right and sound way to deal with this far-reaching national menace." But no action was forthcoming from Washington, Lamar denied any specific arrangement with the *Tribune*, and Garet Garrett decided to take the case to the people and to urge that local communities and individuals secure the ban which the *Tribune* was trying to invoke. Circulars and pamphlets were distributed with some success; Mount Vernon, N. Y., for instance, barred the sale of the Hearst papers within its limits.

While the *Tribune's* efforts were confined to its own pages, Hearst contented himself with denial and countercharge in his columns. He laid the attacks to opposition to his theories of government ownership of public utilities and capitalized on a breach between Frank L. Simonds and the *Tribune* management, in the course of which Simonds's lawyer declared that his client had objected to the use of a news dispatch "of dubious authenticity," reflecting on the conduct of American troops abroad. (The *Tribune* replied to this by quoting the opinion of the court on Simonds's case, that his "grievance was purely fancied and his resignation was unjust." Simonds's articles soon reappeared in the *Tribune* under his own signature.) The circulation of the Hearst publications far exceeded that of the *Tribune*, and none of the other local newspapers took up the fight.

But almost at the outset, the *Tribune* secured a powerful ally.

During the discussions on the Sedition Act, Theodore Roosevelt charged that the Government was punishing the publication of criticism, while permitting graver offenders to go scot-free. Roosevelt was particularly annoyed at the temporary suspension of the *Metropolitan Magazine*, to which he was a frequent contributor, for an article reflecting on Wilson. Pressed for details, the Colonel instanced the treatment of the *Tribune* in the case of Heywood Broun as contrasted with that meted out to Hearst, and cited the *Tribune's* attacks against the latter. This brought the *Tribune's* campaign into the front pages of most of the American press and gave it vastly increased power.

Hearst was now driven to serious exertions. He wrote lengthy explanations of his course, printed extensive summaries of the work of his paper in the national interest (two pages of the *American* were devoted to a list of Hearst employees subscribing to the Red Cross) and numerous testimonials from officials and patriotic or political organizations. Charging that *Tribune* agents had personally incited the action of the Mount Vernon Board of Aldermen, he brought suit for conspiracy. He even resumed the tactics of his war with Pulitzer; when Arthur Draper contributed an article to the "Coiled in the Flag" series, he promptly received a cabled offer to take charge of Hearst's London Bureau at his own figure.

Winkler has recorded that "the *Tribune* onslaught gave the Hearst cabinet many anxious moments."⁵ It also proved to be expensive for the *Tribune*, when a new chain of circumstances caused that paper to make a lone fight, not only against Hearst but against the united strength of the metropolitan press. This development in the tangled situation was due to the organization and method of distribution adopted by the New York newspapers. The chief journals of the city were joined in a Publishers' Association, including, in addition to the Hearst papers and the *Tribune*, the *World*, the *Times*, the *Sun*, the *Herald*, the *Staats-Zeitung*, the *Evening Sun*, *Evening World*, *Evening Telegram*, *Mail*, *Post* and *Globe*. These papers did not sell directly to the newsdealers, but to a delivery service, the American News Company, which in turn sold to the dealers, thus acting both as wholesaler and distributor. In January, 1918, the 1¢ newspapers, com-

prising the majority of the New York journals, sold their papers to the News Company at 50¢ per hundred, the Company sold them to the dealers at 60¢ per hundred, and the dealers charged the public 1¢ each. The mounting cost of print paper and labor during the war caused the publishers great anxiety, and they decided to advance the price to 2¢ per copy. The new scale went into effect by concerted action of the Association on January 26, 1918. Under this arrangement the News Company bought at \$1.25 per hundred and sold at \$1.40. The dealers claimed that their margin of profit at this price was too small, considering the increase of capital involved, and refused to pay more than \$1.20. The publishers balked at this demand and the newsdealers struck. Things were rather lively around Park Row for a while and there were some small riots; but the dealers soon succumbed and on February 8 the strike ended.

A few months later, the sentiment aroused by the attacks on Hearst caused a new boycott on the part of the dealers, directed this time against the *American* and *Journal* only. One dealer later testified that in his case the action was due to the attitude of his customers, and the consequent falling off in demand for these papers. The Publishers' Association, however, regarded the action of the news vendors as a preliminary boycott with an economic motive; that is, they feared if the boycott of Hearst were successful, it would lead to a demand for a general reduction in price. The Association therefore decided to treat it as an illegal boycott, and the members agreed that they would not sell to any dealer who refused to buy or who diminished his order for the Hearst papers.

The *Tribune* felt that to acquiesce in this step would stultify its previous stand against Hearst, and announced its purpose of selling to all dealers, whether they purchased the *Journal* and *American* or not. The Publishers' Association then decided to adopt coercive measures against the *Tribune*. It ordered the American News Company to refuse to deliver the paper to any dealer boycotting Hearst. The *Tribune* attempted to meet the retailers' economic demands by selling to them at \$1.20 per hundred. The News Company thereupon refused to distribute the *Tribune* at all except at the established rate of \$1.40. Checked,

apparently, at every point, the *Tribune* refused to give in and set about organizing its own delivery service—"a thing so difficult and costly to do that no morning newspaper has ever tried it under conditions now existing."

The contest dissolved into a welter of lawsuits and "incipient riots." The city government revoked licenses of anti-Hearst dealers, and the *Tribune* engaged special counsel to secure redress. Finally, on January 16, 1919, the *Tribune* secured an injunction *pendente lite* on behalf of a Brooklyn newsdealer, enjoining the Publishers' Association and the American News Company from refusing to supply the plaintiff with any papers he might wish to purchase. Though this was granted on the grounds that the injunction would do no one harm, previous to trial, whereas failure to grant it might well ruin the retailer, Justice Russell Benedict remarked in passing that the action of the Association and the News Company was "plainly a conspiracy . . . in the highest degree arbitrary, coercive and un-American." By the time the *Tribune* secured this temporary victory, however, the Armistice had been signed, and Hearst had passed through a Congressional Investigation with no very serious reproach. The newspaper war was ended—its last energies were devoted to a mighty protest against Hearst's chairmanship of Mayor Hylan's committee to welcome the returning soldiers.

In battling Hearst, the *Tribune* had not neglected the greater struggle abroad. As the war began to draw to a close, American belligerency was whipped to ever greater heights, and the country began to show symptoms of a well-developed "war psychosis." The *Tribune*, which shared this tendency, was conscious of the heightened public temperature and remarked that "eighteen months of actual participation in the struggle have shown us war in a grimmer shape than when we viewed it from the sidelines no matter how warmly our sympathies were engaged." The *Tribune's* reaction was a fear lest Germany escape too lightly, and a renewed attempt to form public sentiment against such an eventuality.

By the end of September, 1918, the Bulgarians were out of the war and the German case seemed desperate. Chancellor von

Hertling fell from power, and a liberal cabinet came in, led by Prince Maximilian of Baden. On assuming office, October 4, the Prince asked Wilson, through the Swiss, for terms of peace. Wilson replied by asking if the Germans accepted the Fourteen Points and if the new Chancellor was "speaking merely for the constituted authorities of the empire who have so far conducted the war."

The *Tribune* opposed this discussion. It would seem, said the paper, that the Germans were going behind the backs of our Allies, who had most at stake and were taking advantage of America's detached position. The question of government the *Tribune* dismissed with scorn. "Only outside of Germany has there been any sentimental distinction between the Huns who rule and the Huns who serve."

The negotiations went on and the Germans accepted Wilson's terms on October 12. Peace was now in the air, and that part of the press which did not share the *Tribune's* intransigency began to speak of victory as already won. The *Tribune* became alarmed; relaxation of effort now might mean the loss of the fruits of four years of war. Germany must be crushed, utterly. The *Tribune* set itself to drum up the waning martial spirit for a final campaign. On October 14, the headlines of the *American* shouted:

ALL THE WORLD TALKS PEACE AS ROUT OF ENEMY
EXTENDS

The *Tribune* countered with:

NATION CALLS FOR SURRENDER

and filled its pages with quotations from newspapers and ministers the country over, insisting on "Unconditional Surrender." "May we not say once for all," said the editorial, "with no diplomacy, that we hate the Hun, that we mean to crush him utterly, that his hand is a stinking abomination."

The cry for Unconditional Surrender grew more strident. A club was formed in Michigan to advance the cause, and the *Tribune* immediately sponsored it. The paper ran the slogan as

a standing head and asked other newspapers to do the same, securing many adhesions. Inflammatory "Letters to the Editor," such as the following, were prominently displayed:

Sir

The Curse of the Almighty God on all those who want peace *without* Unconditional Surrender

A Heart-broken Mother and
constant reader of your True
Blue Paper

As the defeat of the Germans became more apparent, a new cry was added to the demand for Unconditional Surrender. "We demand the unconditional surrender of Germany and we prefer to receive it on German soil," said the *Tribune*, and this preference soon swelled into a demand for the invasion of Germany. "On To Berlin!"

It is not revenge. It is not justice—or at least not justice alone.

It is the one common sense measure of self-protection. It is the wisest sort of international penology.

The view of former Ambassador Morgenthau is the view of a man who saw the German mind at its best and worst. His plea that Germany be invaded, that the afflictions she has visited upon other nations be visited upon herself, is unanswerable.

This new purpose the *Tribune* supported by printing views of ruined French cities in contrast with untouched Berlin, accompanied by provocative texts.

Of course, all these demands for the vigorous prosecution of the war to the bitter end implied criticism of Wilson's dealings with Germany. Frank Simonds wrote in the *Tribune* after the first note to Prince Maximilian:

To compromise now is to betray our dead, desert our principles, abandon our faith, and to negotiate is to compromise.

An editorial in the paper to the same effect commented, with obvious wrath, that: "In the midst of victory the President has assumed the role of peacemaker." The Democratic press regarded this clamor on the part of the bitter-enders as a false issue raised

for partizan purposes to discredit Wilson and secure a Republican victory in the approaching Congressional elections. Something of this was undoubtedly present in the campaign—the martial bearing of the Old Guard was comic compared with its attitude in 1916. But the *Tribune* at least had a consistent record in this respect. Wilson replied to the opposition by a move which had ample support in precedent but which only gave the Republicans a new line of attack. On October 24, he appealed to the people to give him a Democratic majority in Congress.

This immediately brought to a head the accumulating anger of such Republicans as felt that the conduct of the war had been in the hands of a “partizan monopoly.” The *Tribune* said:

The American people resent the capitalization of great national emotions and impulses for factional advantage. Mr. Wilson’s electioneering appeal struck perhaps the shabbiest note that has yet been struck in this war.

The Democratic press rallied around the President, asserting his right to be free from factional interference in Congress, and accusing the Republicans of concealing their real reason for opposing Wilson, namely, fear of his economic policies. A polemic in the *American* on this subject deserves quotation:

(The Republicans) are not doing politics. They are PATRIOTS. They possess the ONLY simon-pure, 100 per cent, fervent, holy-and-pained patriotism now extant in the original edition.

And they actually think they can make you folks believe that!
Suffering cats! What simpletons they must think you are.

In spite of the eloquence of the learned counsel for the defense, the American people responded to the President’s plea by giving him a substantial Republican majority to wrestle with.

Amid the wrangle of parties, the peace negotiations went on. Wilson, convinced that the German government was acting in good faith at last, referred its request for peace on the basis of the Fourteen Points to the Allies. They accepted on this basis; with reservations, and the *Tribune*, which had advocated a complete embargo on all correspondence with the German government, discontentedly remarked:

Through the offices of the American government, Germany has apparently escaped the utter disaster of unconditional surrender.

The actual terms of the armistice, however, proved sufficiently drastic to permit the *Tribune* to concede something to reality, and on November 11 its headlines announced the welcome tidings:

GERMANY HAS SURRENDERED
WORLD WAR ENDED AT 6 A. M.

The war was over, and the nations immediately set about the work of creating a just and enduring peace.

CHAPTER XVII

BACK TO NORMALCY

IN November, 1918, the situation before the *Tribune* editorial staff showed a close similarity to that which Greeley and his associates faced in 1865. For several years the paper had been wielded as a weapon against German imperialism. Now that single, simple function had all but ceased and the far more complicated task of consolidating the victory remained. That the editors were conscious of the changing atmosphere is shown by their greeting to the new year—1919:

Fighting a war is a difficult task but it stimulates the best in human nature and it can be done and done well. Reconstructing a nation after a war is apt to bring out the lesser side of individuals, and in the reaction from the high tension of achievement and bravery all things are possible.

This prophecy proved unfortunately accurate. The scenes of American reconstruction after the Civil War were repeated on a world-wide scale—all the stupid brutality and the decadence of public and private morality of the later 'sixties were magnified a hundredfold. Through the changing standards and the chaos of a post-war world, the young and vigorous *Tribune* of Ogden Reid had to pick its course as did the aging journal of Horace Greeley.

The immediate necessity, the "house-on-fire," was the formation of a peace. Here again the parallel between 1918 and 1865 is exhibited. When the military strength of the South dissolved before the pounding guns of Grant and Sherman, the terms of reconstructing the nation had been already laid down by Lincoln in his Amnesty Proclamation of 1863. On January 8, 1918, President Wilson issued his sketch of a reconstructed world, the Fourteen Points. In substance, this Amnesty Proclamation of President Wilson demanded the "evacuation and restoration" of all territory invaded by the armies of the Central Powers. The frontiers of Italy were to be redrawn "along clearly recognizable lines of nationality," and, in deference to the same principle, Alsace-

Lorraine was to go to France, the diverse peoples of Austro-Hungary were to be "accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous self-development," and an independent Polish state erected with free access to the sea. Even the populations of the various colonial possessions were to be consulted in a general plan of readjustment, and autonomy secured to the non-Turkish elements of the Ottoman Empire.

Besides these specific territorial requirements, the Fourteen Points included an outline of new principles of international relations to succeed the international anarchy which had led up to the world catastrophe. These included "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at"; the removal of artificial economic barriers between states; the reduction of armaments; "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas"; and, lastly:

A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

The public response to this magnificent program was, though generally enthusiastic, not without a spice of criticism. The *Democratic Times*, for instance, pointed out that, while the Fourteen Points were undoubtedly splendid, the war must first be won on the field of battle, while a cable from the *Tribune's* London Bureau commented sharply on the tendency of certain English journals to criticize the message adversely. The *Tribune's* reaction was one of complete admiration—in January, 1918. The message was beyond praise; "he has translated from vague aspiration to clear and definite fact the war aims of his countrymen. . . . He has defined the frontiers and written the constitution of the new world for which we fight."

The greatest single merit of Mr. Wilson's latest address is that it will consolidate a nation behind its Chief Executive and establish in all minds that of right and with full accuracy and accepted authority he speaks for them.

Thus far the parallel between the *Tribune* of 1865 and that of 1918 is tolerably close in respect to its preparation for the task of reconstruction. But as has been shown, the last months of the

war considerably increased the *Tribune's* hatred toward Germany; the paper became an exponent of that "justice" against which Greeley had fought fifty years before. With victory assured, the *Tribune* began to reassess the Fourteen Points as they appeared more certainly to be the actual basis of the peace. Would they provide sufficient punishment for Germany? Would the doctrine of autonomous nationalities interfere with the strategic frontiers which the Allies might deem necessary to maintain their security? Would not the point as to open discussion of peace terms lead to confusion and mistrust? And what did "freedom of the seas" mean? The British navy had been perhaps the most effective single weapon in the war, which would not have been the case had the old American doctrine of "free ships make free goods" been scrupulously applied. And as to reducing economic barriers—might not that lead to German "dumping" for economic mastery where physical force had failed? All these questions were agitated in the *Tribune*. On November 4, the paper definitely broke with the Wilson program:

The fourteen points are on trial in the court of Allied opinion.

They represent Mr. Wilson's idea of peace with Germany.

They have been formally accepted by the German government.

They have not been accepted by the Allies, nor have they received the verdict of American sentiment.

A dangerous fiction of acceptance grew up about them in all countries. In this country they were provisionally taken to represent an abstract ideal of peace. At the time peace itself seemed very remote and people were preoccupied with war. Besides, the war emotion had not yet fully crystallized, and many who were dubious about the fourteen points withheld criticism lest a political discussion of peace terms should distract popular attention from a business more imperative.

In Great Britain and France the fourteen points were received with profound disappointment but it was confined to private expression. There, as here, the choice was dictated by considerations of moral and political expediency. It was better to "support" the President rhetorically than to fall into a wrangle over peace terms in the hearing of an unbeaten enemy. . . .

. . . On Tuesday the American people will speak. The issue is formulated.

Do we want a Wilson peace on the basis of the fourteen conditions, or do we want, first, the unconditional surrender of Germany and then a peace the conditions of which shall be imposed upon a criminal nation?

The verdict of the people was rendered against the Democratic Party, and so, presumably, against a Wilson peace. But the War Council of the Allies accepted the Fourteen Points as a basis of negotiations before the Armistice, reserving the question of the freedom of the seas to the definitive peace conference and interpreting the condition as to evacuation and restoration of invaded territory to mean compensation by Germany "for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property." On this basis, the Germans signed the Armistice.

The *Tribune's* underlying objection to the Wilson terms was threefold—they were not stringent enough in spirit to evoke a just peace; they were not practical enough to secure a permanent peace; and, finally, the interposition of Wilson as the Allied spokesman was presumptuous. The *Tribune* reacted against the common assumption here that this country had won the war, with its corollary that we were to dictate the peace. An essay by Frank Simonds neatly summarized the frame of mind displayed by numerous *Tribune* editorials and special articles. The greatest gain of the war, said Simonds, was the unity of Great Britain, France and the United States. He feared, since "there is something almost pathetic in the eagerness of the French, British and Italian peoples . . . to demonstrate their gratitude for aid given by the United States," that the Allies would relinquish "their own just rights." It would be better for America to make a separate peace than sacrifice its association with France and Great Britain

. . . in the eager desire to exploit that friendship in the formal language of a constitution of the world or in an effort to impose upon two great nations, who have made sacrifices for the common cause tenfold as great as ours, restrictions which would imperil their future, while merely gratifying our vanity or ministering to our real or sham idealism.

It was in this conception of the Allies that the *Tribune* differed from the majority of the American press and public. The paper had no rooted distrust of their motives, and sympathized with their desires. It would fain have left the chief share of peacemaking to them on their own terms, and cemented them to the United States in fast alliance, working for the practical administration of inter-

national justice rather than its formulation in set phrases. When the Lloyd George government in England, in the "Khaki election" which followed hard on the Armistice, was returned on a platform pledging the Kaiser's execution and the German payment of all the expenses of the war, the *Tribune* interpreted it, approvingly, as a "sweeping victory for stern justice, for the practical as against the chimerical, for order and stanch nationalism against Bolshevism and pacifism and all the brood of anarchy and confusion."

It was in this frame of mind that the *Tribune* viewed Wilson's triumphal progress to Paris. The paper did not approve of the President's personal appearance on the scene of the negotiations in the first place. It felt that he should not "go to the mountain"; that the elections of November had revealed that American confidence in him was shaken. His precise intentions were unknown, and the country was left in a "state of utter mystery and doubt" as to what he would do in Europe. As a negotiator, "a rebuked and discredited leader," the President might commit the country before its wishes could be consulted. The *Tribune* expressed fear of the egoism revealed in Wilson's public utterances and bade him farewell with an ironic editorial:

And so the President of the United States sets forth on an unlimited errand. What will come of it he himself does not know. The faithful think it will make him President of the United States of the World.

The United States of the World! That was the vision that gleamed on the horizon of 1919, the fourteenth of the famous points and darling project of Wilson's heart. It appealed with force to the war-wearied peoples and almost all approved the ideal. But when it came to make the vision concrete, the confusion of conflicting ideas made for a veritable Babel, and the *Tribune* became a curious epitome of the general turmoil. The paper had obtained a long and impressive list of contributors to comment on the peace negotiations; George W. Wickersham, André Cheradame, Chester M. Wright, Frederick Moore, Bampton Hunt, Samuel Crowther and Frank L. Simonds. In addition, there were special *Tribune* representatives at the various European capitals to report the repercussions of the treaty—Elias Tobenkin, Joseph

Saxe, S. C. Segue and William C. Dreher at Berlin, George W. Glass (the Financial Editor of the *Glasgow Herald*) at London, Carter Field and Theodore M. Knappen at Washington. These writers were allowed considerable independence in stating their views, and the opinions expressed in the *Tribune* diverged widely. For instance, George W. Wickersham, a former Attorney General of the United States, and a member of the American delegation at Paris, supplied temperate and judicial news articles on the progress of the treaty, generally favorable in tone to Wilson's views. On the other hand, André Cheradame, a French publicist, wrote frank propaganda in the interest of his own nation.

The conflict became even more apparent when Wilbur Forrest, having completed his work with the A. E. F. by a survey and vindication of the administration of the embarkation camp at Brest, joined Arthur Draper at Paris as a regular staff representative of the paper. Draper's articles won him the acclaim of Wilson's supporters, while Forrest felt that the Wilson peace lacked practical virtues. The work of both men appeared side by side in the *Tribune*, and to complete the picture, "Ding" drew cartoons showing Columbus, Fulton, the signers of the Articles of Confederation and Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau with their League Plan alike reviled as "Visionary and Impractical," while the regular editorial page was applying that very term. The *Tribune* resembled more the impartial forum than the organized protagonist of any one idea during the peace negotiations.

Nevertheless, the paper had a policy concerning the Fourteenth Point and the editorial page expressed it consistently. In the first place, the *Tribune* sympathized with Cheradame's statement that the French wanted Germany punished before theorizing about a League of Nations, and suggested that the discussion of international association be postponed until peace was made. But Wilson secured for his league the first position on the agenda of the conference, and the *Tribune* was forced to argue the case immediately.

That some sort of union between nations was desirable to preserve the hard-won respite of arms, the *Tribune* admitted freely, but it insisted that it should be based on actualities. Speaking of the "perils of the ideal," the paper said:

What wrecked the Holy Alliance . . . was not its badness, but its goodness. A dream of romantic religious idealism, it was too much for human nature and became a refuge of wickedness.

The *Tribune's* theory was that the preservation of peace should be left to a definite alliance between England, France and the United States, on the foundation of the coöperation existing during the late hostilities. It would not then have to be created *ab ovo*, would have a guarantee of force and would apply to practical issues. That this would revive in effect the old system of the balance of power, the *Tribune* did not fear to admit. "We may drop the phrase which has acquired a bad name. But in the mechanics of world politics the thing which the phrase stood for seems certain to survive." The three major powers were at that time in session for the purpose of securing certain definite ends. Minor states were present to present their claims. Might not, suggested the *Tribune*, this meeting of plenipotentiaries be the germ of a real association of nations? Gradually extending in scope and gradually institutionalized, the Peace Conference could become a living, expanding force for international governance, whereas to force the world into the straitjacket of an artificial constitution might reduce it to the status of a machine. The *Tribune* evidently envisioned something like the Congress of Europe, which, at several times before the Great War, operated to preserve the peace. With Great Britain, France, United States joined by Japan and Italy in a five-power pact, there might be a permanent guarantee of peace.

At all events, the *Tribune* insisted that a union to preserve peace must have the power to enforce it. Clemenceau was applauded editorially when he said: "France will gladly join a league which has enforcing power. Will America?" Many Americans wished our entry into association with other nations to be hedged about with restrictions or harked back to Washington's words and objected to any political union with "foreigners" whatever. William Randolph Hearst, in a signed editorial before the Armistice was signed, urged caution; America had in Washington's day been too weak to engage in "entangling alliances"—it was now too strong to need them. Theodore Roosevelt, whose editorials in the *Kansas City Star* were reproduced in the *Tribune*, proposed a

league which would reserve to each nation the right of determining tariff and general economic policies, immigration and citizenship laws and form of government, as well as exempting certain definite spheres of influence—Eastern Asia and the Caribbean, for example—from the action of league members other than those who had predominant interest therein. Any conflict not affecting these reserved rights or areas was to be referred to and judged by “some species of court” whose decrees were to be enforced by the whole strength of the league. This was an association with teeth, but its actions were more limited than the *Tribune* considered necessary.

Considering the *Tribune's* predilections, the paper's reactions to the first draft of the Covenant of the League of Nations are understandable. On February 15, 1919, the *Tribune* published the draft in full on the first page and devoted several columns to a minute dissection of its terms. There were two major problems posed by this Covenant, said an editorial:

1. Does it safeguard peace?
2. Does it represent any substantial gain over the Hague agreement of 1907 in the direction of making war less likely?

The *Tribune* answered its own questions in the negative:

There is no direct safeguarding of peace. To each nation is reserved liberty of action. There is no limitation on armaments, no international police force under the control of the League. Every question is referable to home governments for the real decision. The executive committee provided for is in the nature of an ambassadorial council such as is a commonplace of diplomacy. The only advance is the slight one in the provision for meetings at stated times, instead of as now on call.

The *Tribune* also protested that the terms of the Covenant were too vague. The principle of mandated colonies was approved by the paper as was the exclusion of Germany, but it held that the greatest advantage of the document lay in strengthening the existing Entente Cordiale between the Allies.

Among the general run of Americans, a different line of attack was opened against the League—not that it committed the nations to too little, but that it committed the United States to too much.

Characteristic of this approach to the subject were the statements of the League for the Preservation of American Independence, which asserted that the initial draft of the Covenant abrogated the Monroe Doctrine; did not provide for withdrawal; made it obligatory upon America to declare war upon the decision of a group of foreign states, ignoring the provision of the Constitution delegating that authority to Congress, and in many other ways infringed upon American sovereignty. Numerous amendments to the League were proposed, including seven which Charles E. Hughes formulated in a speech before the Union League Club. Hughes suggested, among others, that the Monroe Doctrine be incorporated in the Covenant, that free withdrawal be permitted, that the extent of purely national matters not under the jurisdiction of the League be defined and that the famous Article X, wherein the League guaranteed the territorial integrity of its members, be eliminated.

Since this was the line later taken by revisionists in the Senate, the *Tribune's* reactions are of interest. "The world has looked in vain for teeth in the covenant," it said after Hughes's speech, "but even the roots of the teeth are to be extracted."

The conferees at Paris endeavored to meet some of the American objections, and the result was a revised Covenant, signed on April 28, 1919. The Monroe Doctrine was specifically reserved, but Article X was retained. The *Tribune* found the final draft "a spineless and inconsistent document." It reproached "the iniquitous Article X," not because it meant American connection with European affairs, but because its territorial guarantee froze the *status quo*—"there is the sin against the Holy Ghost of developing liberty." In all, the *Tribune* considered the constitution of the League of Nations "a climacteric of humbugging."

With the League Covenant embodied in the treaty and a serious revolt against it in progress in the United States, the Peace Conference went on about the rest of its business—and the *Tribune* found an increasing measure of satisfaction as the session wore on. The Conference asserted that Germany was solely responsible for the war, to which the *Tribune*, in company with most of the Allied press, heartily agreed. The historical school of revisionists, which refuses to admit this basic assumption of the Treaty of

Versailles, was very small in 1919; practically its only exponent in the American press was the *New Republic*, edited by Herbert Croly. The *Tribune* waxed wroth at any implication of Russia, for instance, in Germany's guilt, and printed bitter articles on the New Mugwumps. The older brand, of the *Evening Post* school, were characterized by "moral chestiness," according to the *Tribune*, while the Croly type was intellectually arrogant—" 'Crolier' than thou." They were "blame-minglers," and their "monumental mendacity" was "sapping the moral foundations of the war."

On the "moral foundation" of Germany's unique guilt, the *Tribune* was prompt to demand the utmost of payment in reparation of Teuton damages. It suggested that Germany reimburse France and Belgium from her store of art treasures for those destroyed in the war, and Royal Cortissoz estimated the value of the painting and sculpture in German galleries. As reparation also, as well as to prevent the resumption of her "sinister colonial experiment," the *Tribune* applauded the sequestration of the German colonies. It favored giving the Saar Valley to France and was disappointed that she did not obtain the whole Rhine boundary. The doctrine of self-determination did not quite please the paper; it was annoyed at the "rapacious" little states and feared the logical Austro-German *Anschluss* which might be the sequence of such a policy. But a strong Poland, holding Danzig, would be valuable as a "sanitary cordon" between Russia and Germany.

The *Tribune's* satisfaction with the completed treaty, apart from the League of Nations, may be explained by an article by one of its correspondents in Paris, Frederick Moore, published just after the treaty was signed. The title was "A Changed President," and it asserted that Wilson had broken "with those youthful, radical, parlor Bolsheviki with whom he surrounded himself." In proof whereof Moore instanced "the terms of the peace treaty whose severity satisfies the most practical men."

The Versailles Treaty signed, the next problem was to secure its ratification by the United States Senate. This body was touched in its sovereign dignity by Wilson's failure to include any Senators in his treaty-making entourage. Further, many of them were discontented with the Covenant of the League as embodied in the treaty, and wished it revised in the direction indicated by the

Hughes amendments. The *Tribune*, on June 10, 1919, published the text of the treaty, and called for its ratification, with the following reservations as to the League:

1. Preserve the Monroe Doctrine.
2. Keep us out of quarrels not our concern.
3. Lift the indefinite obligations of Article X.

As this was substantially the spirit of the Hughes amendments, it is evident that the *Tribune* felt the League of little importance, save as an integral part of the peace treaty. To save the treaty, the paper was willing to concede to the Senate the roots of the League's teeth, since the latter were not at all formidable anyway. The *Tribune* saw in the treaty itself a guarantee of the maintenance of the wartime bond between the Allied Powers, as they would be equally obligated to enforce its provisions.

But President Wilson refused to permit any further whittling at the League, refused to accept the reservations proposed by the Senate. The *Tribune* rebuked him, saying: "If the treaty becomes dead there will be no general doubt as to whence comes the dagger that pierced its heart. Its handle bears the initials 'W. W.'" The Senate came to a vote in March, 1920, and the President's supporters joined with those "bitter-enders" who wanted no league at all. The Senators who would ratify with reservations were defeated, and the signature of the United States to the Treaty of Versailles became invalid. The *Tribune's* comment on this peculiar ending to the Great Crusade was

The result must not be read as meaning that this country withdraws from the world in selfish isolation. . . . But the wiser course seems to be to seize the first opportunity, likely to be offered in little more than a year, to adhere to the league.

The *Tribune* referred in this statement to the fact that another Presidential election was at hand, which might place a more com-plaisant figure in the White House. The League already loomed as a complex political issue, and other by-products of the emotional idealism of the war years were in train to make the campaign of 1920 the most important since 1860.

One of the most perplexing, though not the most important of

these civil offshoots of belligerency was Prohibition. The trend toward governmental control of liquor had begun in this country during the moral earnestness of the 'forties. Greeley was enthusiastically for national Prohibition at first, but in his later years, the *Tribune's* official position was less extreme, and tended to uphold local option. Under Whitelaw Reid, the *Tribune* was a temperance paper. It favored "high-license" laws for the control of saloons and was respectful to the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Anti-Saloon League. The Prohibition Party, which usually drew its strength from the Republicans, was not so highly regarded—partly because it weakened the *Tribune's* party (as, notably, in the campaign of 1884) and partly because the paper felt that the attempt to secure temperance by an amendment to the Federal Constitution was a perversion of the spirit of that document.

By 1917, Prohibition was a fact in twenty-two states, and on December 18 of that year Congress proposed the Eighteenth Amendment, forbidding the "manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors . . . for beverage purposes" in the United States and its territories. The *Tribune* was perplexed; on April 17 it stated its position:

The *Tribune's* policy is already well known.

It excludes the advertising of wines, beers and liquors.

The reason for excluding such advertising is the conviction that good business and alcohol are incompatible.

On business principles, therefore, the *Tribune* is for absolute Prohibition.

That would be enough to say if it were a business question only. But it has many other aspects, emotional, political and scientific. Indeed, the controversy is so ramified in every department of knowledge, opinion and tradition that it is unbounded except by the limits of human experience.

We prefer for the present to waive the vanity of disclosing our own emotional reactions. They are irrelevant. But on some other aspects of the question we have been taking thought.

The editorial went on to consider the complete lack of experience which the world possessed to judge "such an adventure in restraint" as absolute prohibition of all alcoholic beverages. Russia had attempted it, but all data were lost in the chaos of revolution.

Since this was so, "consider the cost and be deliberate" was the *Tribune's* advice.

There has never been a vote on utter prohibition in this state; and to insist on a referendum before the Federal Amendment is ratified by the Legislature was not to put one's self beyond the pale of decency.

The *Tribune* also professed an "open and unbiased curiosity" as to the scientific aspects of the matter, and proposed a forum to discuss the subject. This evoked a number of replies from distinguished thinkers and physiologists, pro and con—but state after state ratified the Eighteenth Amendment. The "swift and hurried process" went on beneath the public interest in the war, and was undoubtedly aided by the Federal wartime regulation of the alcoholic content of liquors. Prohibition and patriotism became oddly synonymous, as letters to the *Tribune* revealed. The Germans were to blame—they were plotting against English distillers and French winegrowers, or the people were disgusted at the pro-German activities of the brewers.

The *Tribune* continued its skeptical attitude, puzzling over the manner in which the states were ratifying, in the face of protests from returning soldiers. "It is as if a sailing ship on a windless ocean were sweeping ahead, propelled by some invisible force . . . one of the wonders of our political history." Drys accused the paper of doing nothing to promote the great work, but the *Tribune* only opposed a sort of passive resistance to the "mysterious rush" and queried if it were due to war emotion or an instinctive reaction to Bolshevik license? And on January 28, 1919, after the thirty-sixth state had ratified the Amendment and the day before the Secretary of State declared it law of the land, the *Tribune* indulged in a bit of prophecy. The liquor traffic, it claimed, was based only on social tradition.

Putting the ban of illegality on it and eliminating its social sanctions will inevitably destroy it.

But then—that was in 1919.

A far more pregnant result of war's unrest was the spread of radical theory in government. This was especially true following the Russian revolution and the establishment of the Communist

state. Radicals in politics and in labor were stirred as never before, and conservatives felt again the chill fear of mass uprising. Extraordinary measures to stamp out the peril were taken by legislatures and public officials everywhere. Mayor John Hylan of New York forbade the use of red flags at public gatherings; the New York State Legislature empowered the Lusk Committee to investigate radicalism in the state, and expelled five regularly elected Socialist Assemblymen.

The *Tribune* detested Bolshevism, which it then interpreted as meaning license, revolt "against all forms of human restraint," rather than the integrated, despotic state which it has since come to mean. It was heartily for military action against the Soviets and protested against trying to combat Communism by feeding hungry Russians as "pouring gasoline on a fire." But the paper preferred that the evil be fought in its breeding place across the seas, rather than by extralegal means at home. True, it felt that Hylan's prohibition of the use of the red flag, while illegal, was justified because of the fundamental antagonism between that banner and the Stars and Stripes. But the arbitrary expulsion of the Socialist Assemblymen awakened the *Tribune's* full wrath. It was "a lynching," "a vicious precedent." The expelled members were not representatives of the Socialist Party, but of their constituencies.

Whoever is elected sits not as a member of any party, but as a delegate of citizens.

The wave of economic unrest found its way into the Treaty of Versailles—there was a Labor Commission and labor articles. It worked into practical politics, and the *Tribune* sent Geoffrey Parsons to the Middle West to investigate a Non-Partizan League, which planned to carry the Granger legislation a step farther—to state-owned farm credit banks and state-owned grain elevators. Parsons found some un-American features in this league. It tended, he felt, to emphasize class hatreds, but he believed it might prove a "salutary experiment."

Another symptom of the changing times which appeared during the war was an increased deference to the movement for women's suffrage. The *Tribune* had been mildly jocular at the expense of

the Suffragettes in 1912, but when, in September, 1918, Wilson asked the Senate to pass a suffrage amendment as a war measure, the paper said:

The suffrage amendment must pass here and now. We greatly hope that it will be accepted by such a margin of votes as will place the faith of this country in the fundamental truths of its government beyond the questioning of criticism or debate.

It will have been noticed that the *Tribune's* view of many of these by-products of the war was relatively detached and judicial. But the paper itself was not blind to the fact that the war must induce great changes in national life, and had its own chart of the directions which those changes should take. At first the *Tribune's* ideas visualized a radical alteration of the American philosophy of government; the gradual return to a system remarkably like that preached by Whitelaw Reid gives the measure of the "slump in idealism" which followed the high tension of the war.

On April 1, 1918, the *Tribune* announced flatly that "Theodore Roosevelt will be the Republican candidate for President in 1920," and took the text of Roosevelt's speech in Portland the previous day as its platform:

1. The creation of a broader spirit of patriotism—patriotism self-reliant and critical rather than docile and muzzled.
2. An emancipation from the costly delusions of pacifism; permanent universal military training and service and a citizenship based on such service.
3. Complete Americanization of all alien groups and elements; the suppression of hyphenatism and of the foreign language newspapers which minister to hyphenatism.
4. A readjustment of the relations of labor in general to the state and to production.
5. The economic reorganization of agriculture.
6. The reorganization of business.

These planks, said the *Tribune*, "are all compatible with the best and most progressive Republican thought and tradition." The first three were an evident result of the war, an attempt to carry into permanent civil life the ideals which the *Tribune* had, since 1915, stressed as essential for America during the period of beligerency. Since the war was still in full blast, these planks re-

ceived the greatest attention and were amplified in a series of editorials. The last three were unfortunately ignored by the *Tribune* in subsequent discussions, so that there is no condensed version of the paper's stand on the economic changes which Roosevelt meditated. There is little evidence that the *Tribune's* interest in Progressivism of the vintage of 1918 extended to more than the inculcation of militaristic nationalism of a rather extreme sort.

In the midst of the feverish activity of the war, it did not seem at all unlikely that some such violent diversion of American folkways as the *Tribune* and Roosevelt proposed would ensue. Even the *World*, which regarded the exponents of universal military training and its corollary nationalist enthusiasms as "pinchbeck imperialists," feared their success was quite possible. But with the armistice the war emotion began to simmer down, and the cooling off process gathered momentum as the months passed. Both pacifist and militarist were to be disappointed by the temper of the country.

A severe blow to the *Tribune's* hope of transforming the nation occurred on the night of January 6, 1919. The personality of Theodore Roosevelt was vital in bridging the gap between the America which had existed before 1914 and that which the paper hoped to see after the election of 1920. It transmuted a cause which was really close to a glorification of the Prussian state to something resembling healthy and vigorous Americanism. Early in 1918, a passing illness of Roosevelt evoked this queer little appeal from the *Tribune*, printed at the head of the editorial page:

Theodore Roosevelt, listen! You must be up and well again! We cannot have it otherwise. We could not run this world without you.

A year later the soul of Roosevelt passed in his sleep. The *Tribune* bade him farewell in a sincere editorial, and published a fine pictorial tribute to its lost leader—Jay N. Darling's famous "The Long, Long Trail." And the spirit went out of the New Nationalism.

In casting about for a new guide, the *Tribune* looked favorably upon Herbert Clark Hoover—savior of the Belgian babies and Food Administrator of the United States, and hence of half the

world. The only objection to Hoover, said the paper, lay in the fact that he had voted for Wilson in 1916.

This action he probably now regrets as much as anyone, and scarcely is it to be charged against him. Wise is the party that sometimes forgets and allows bygones to be bygones.

Hoover was quite a different type from Roosevelt, and the fact that the *Tribune* seriously considered him early in 1920 is evidence that the more flamboyant virtues of the latter were losing some of their appeal. But the paper clung to its former ideal, and felt it best expressed by General Leonard Wood. Wood had been the colonel of the Rough Riders; he had been a capable administrator in Cuba and one of the most influential forces for preparedness before our entry into the war. The Administration had kept him at home in a subordinate position during the fighting, which gave an interesting touch of martyrdom to his career. Best of all, to the *Tribune*, Wood was the "heir of Roosevelt," his brother "in most things of the spirit," the last great preacher of militant nationalism.

But even with Leonard Wood as its candidate the recession of the *Tribune* from the extreme nationalist position continued. The fevered moral earnestness of the country was fast ebbing away, and the Republican platform of 1920 shows clearly that the party as a whole wanted nothing better than a return to more placid ways of living. Prohibition was accepted as a *fait accompli* and did not figure in the document at all; women's suffrage the same. Labor problems were dealt with in a cautious spirit; a plank in favor of unemployment insurance was rejected as premature, and the platform confined itself to a declaration against child labor and in favor of collective bargaining. Preparedness was advocated in general terms, without committing the party to universal military training, and the forceful measures previously advocated by the *Tribune* and Roosevelt for the elimination of unassimilated foreign groups dwindled to a mild provision for the annual registration of aliens. The protective principle was reaffirmed; economy was demanded; the return of the Civil Service to a prewar basis and the resumption of the railroads by private owners insisted

upon. The party asserted its belief in "an international association," which would not compromise "national independence"—without reference to the existing League of Nations. For the rest, the lengthy platform was a denunciation of the Democratic Administration.

This platform the *Tribune* considered "a well thought out, progressive and constructive document." It praised the equivocal stand on the League as

. . . simply laying down the broad principles which the Republican party purposes adhering to in international relations. President Wilson has violated these principles. The theory of Republican strategy will be to allow him to try to justify that violation by demanding explicit approval both of his autocratic methods as a negotiator and of his sacrosanct treaty draft.

But, though the *Tribune* admired the conservative stand of the Republican convention in its formal expression of opinion, the further activities of that body were not at all to the paper's taste. Leonard Wood and Governor Frank O. Lowden of Illinois were the strongest candidates before the convention, but both were somewhat damaged by revelations of huge primary expenditures in their behalf. Moreover there were many "favorite sons" in the running, and, as the session began, the *Tribune* expressed the fear that this might create the situation "predicted by Mr. Daugherty of Ohio, some time ago—namely, to have seven or eight gentlemen sitting behind closed doors to dictate the choice by trades and an exchange of pledges." Mr. Daugherty proved an astute prophet, and Senator Warren G. Harding of Ohio, an amiable member of the Old Guard, emerged as the choice of the seven or eight gentlemen (and of the convention) as the Republican nominee for the Presidency.

The *Tribune* was highly annoyed. "Republics are still ungrateful," said an editorial. "'Stand pat' politicians and small business men" feared the recrudescence of Rooseveltism, while Congress was tired of strong men in the White House.

We had hoped that a man of undoubted courage, vision and executive ability would be chosen, but we have instead Warren Gamaliel Harding, one of the Senate group which controlled the convention. It would be hypocritical for the *Tribune* to pretend that it is satisfied with the result.

On the other hand, the Democrats, in the paper's opinion, had given ample proof during the past eight years that as a party they were unfit to govern. Then too, the *Tribune* could give its fullest support to the Republican platform and to the Vice-Presidential candidate, Governor Calvin Coolidge of Massachusetts, "who has an inspiring record and who shows real promise of still greater accomplishments."

Under our present political methods it is impossible to indorse the platform and Vice-Presidential nominee without also voting for the head of the ticket. . . .

The *Tribune*, therefore, purposes to give its hearty support to the Republican candidates and the platform on which they stand, and believes that an overwhelming majority of voters will do the same.

The Democrats nominated Governor James M. Cox of Ohio for President—hardly an inspiring choice—and Franklin D. Roosevelt for Vice-President. The campaign then passed into a state of extreme chaos as far as details were concerned. Woodrow Wilson had expressed the hope that there would be a "solemn referendum" as to the League of Nations, but the Republicans dodged the issue as far as possible and concentrated on the personality of Wilson himself. Party leaders, such as Taft, Hughes and Wickersham, gave the country to understand that Republican victory would mean acceptance of the Covenant with the Senate reservations. But Harding's views were hard to determine, and in the end he came out flatly for rejection of the Wilson League. The *Tribune* referred to England's "splendid isolation" in the nineteenth century, when her "most beneficent influence for peace" was exerted, though "she avoided express agreement to act."

Now that American aloofness is gone never to return, may it not be that we shall serve the best by being in, but not too far in?

But though the League issue was confused, though most of the Republican assaults tended to center upon Wilson's "despotic one-manism," his "species of Peruvian Incaism" (poor Cox was almost ignored; the *Tribune* said "though the voice may be the voice of Cox, the hand is the hand of Wilson"), the underlying conflict was

clear enough. It was a reaction of large masses of the population against the war and all it stood for in the way of over-stimulated idealism and the sterner virtues. America was like England in the last days of the Commonwealth, sighing for a merry and undemanding Stuart. Wilson, the exalted Covenanter, went down before Harding, who was "one of the boys." The Republican candidate felt the temper of the people; in happy if incorrect phraseology he called for a return to "normalcy." And on November 3, 1920, the *Tribune* headlines read: **HARDING SWEEPS THE COUNTRY.**

The *Tribune* had been one of the first journals in the land to succumb to the emotional sweep of the war; it was one of the last to subside into the matter-of-fact ways of peace. But with the election of Warren Harding it took up the threads of policy which had been so violently disarranged in 1914 and once more wove the sober pattern which Whitelaw Reid had designed. On July 2, 1921, a single column (on the left-hand side of the page, at that) bore the heading:

Senate Votes War at End;
Harding to Sign today.

In the position of honor on the right, a three column banner read:

Dempsey and Georges
Fit for Battle Today;
Gate Nears \$1,500,000.

The *Tribune* and the United States were back to normalcy.

CHAPTER XVIII

BUILDING ON ROCK

THE end of the war found the *Tribune* in a far stronger position than it had occupied when Ogden Reid became managing editor five years before. A vigorous, almost sensational, editorial policy had attracted nationwide attention. The news service was greatly improved; reporters and commentators such as Arthur Draper, Wilbur Forrest and Geoffrey Parsons had built up reputations and following. Both news and editorial writers by their independence had done much to destroy the legend of servile partizanship created in the decades before 1912. Features had been ably selected to provide intelligent entertainment. The critical departments maintained, on the whole, their traditional excellence. And the net result had been an increase in circulation from a dwindling 25,000 or so in 1912 to over 90,000 in 1918.

But peace brought new problems. Expenses had more than kept pace with rising receipts. The wartime circulation was, in several ways, abnormal. The transcendent interest of the public in war news sold many more papers than usual; the *Tribune's* emphatic campaigns for truth in advertising, for preparedness and for loyalty stimulated a transient interest which would have to be maintained on a sounder basis. The *Tribune*, in 1918, had not really found itself.

The introduction of the idea of mass circulation by Pulitzer and Hearst had been an unsettling experience for New York journalists. In publishers whose eyes remained fixed only on volume of subscribers it tended to induce an "all things to all men" frame of mind—sensational news and make-up to attract the casual reader, seasoned with highly intellectual features for the more thoughtful. There is something to be said for such eclectic publications, but from the advertiser's point of view they lack concentration of coverage. With the exception of those commodities whose use is practically universal, a more distinct field of influence is desirable. For

instance, a paper may have a fine literary staff worthy of the attention of profitable patrons of the book stores, but if the reviews are flanked by a slangy and popular sports section, book publishers will be dubious of the value of that paper's circulation figures to them. It is unusual for readers to purchase more than one morning newspaper, and they are apt to prefer a consistent sheet.

The particular clientèle of the *Tribune* has varied at different times in its history. The Weekly was always a rural encyclopedia. The Daily had an intellectual appeal; a goodly share of what is now known as the Park Avenue trade fell to it, and usually it was of great interest to politicians. But almost from the beginning it had a peculiar strength in the suburbs.

The implications of this regional distribution are fairly clear. It postulates a family newspaper, read by father, mother and the children. The *Herald Tribune's* own conception of this field is "the city without slums"—inhabited by literate people of a certain income and culture, demanding solid information and entertainment that is always in good taste.

To integrate the *Tribune*—news, features and editorial policy—for the purpose of cultivating this lucrative market became the object of the paper's management in the years following the war period. In this development the interesting personality of Mrs. Ogden Reid was of primary importance.

Helen Rogers Reid was born in Appleton, Wisconsin, in the same year as her future husband. In 1903 she graduated from Barnard College, and proposed to enter the teaching profession. Instead she was selected by Mrs. Whitelaw Reid as social secretary, and in 1906 journeyed to London with the family upon Whitelaw Reid's appointment to the embassy there. In England she met Ogden Reid. Helen Rogers's quiet competence had made a favorable impression upon the Reid household, and the marriage between the secretary and the son of the house was a welcome event. The wedding took place in Racine, Wisconsin, in 1911, and shortly after the return of the couple to New York Ogden Reid was given charge of the *Tribune* and set about its rejuvenation.

The younger Mrs. Reid brought to the responsibilities of home-making an energy and independence which refused to accept that task as her only sphere of activity. Softspoken and diminutive, her

distinctly feminine appearance cloaked a firm will and great practical good sense. In principle she was opposed to the traditional limitations placed upon womankind, while in her own person she was well equipped to illustrate the folly of such restrictions.

For the first six years of married life, Mrs. Reid had no official connection with the *Tribune*. During that time, two children, Whitelaw and Elisabeth, were born to the Reids. In addition to the care of the children, Mrs. Reid busied herself in the cause of woman's suffrage, an activity which, as has been shown, the *Tribune* warmly supported. Yet, despite the lack of formal association with the paper, Mrs. Reid was definitely in the *Tribune* atmosphere. The Reid family life, whatever temporary interests may engage various members, has always revolved about the paper. It is a continual source of pride, a frequent worry, an abiding tradition and a constant theme of discussion. It is small wonder that a woman of active intelligence and inquiring mind was able to familiarize herself with the details of newspaper management under such circumstances.

In 1918, with the suffrage battle won, Ogden Reid invited his wife to join the staff of the *Tribune*. Her choice of the advertising branch of the paper in preference to the more literary atmosphere of the editorial department would have seemed a prodigy in an earlier time, but it was characteristic of Helen Rogers Reid and the epoch just beginning. For several months she personally solicited advertising accounts; then she became Advertising Director, the position she still holds.

Mrs. Reid's performance of the particular duties of this post was marked by intelligence and downright hard work. She was at her desk promptly at nine, meticulously kept all business appointments, and often remained in the office until far into the evening. Subordinates were expected to show equal devotion; they were encouraged by inspirational talks, bonuses and example, or rebuked, without bluster, yet convincingly. The Director rigorously reviewed all work, reading copy, suggesting changes of a single word or of a mere fraction of an inch in the width of a decorative border. As her associates proudly say, Mrs. Reid has a positive genius for detail. There is a certain contrast here between the methods of the editor and his Advertising Director. The one will assign a job and

judge by the results, the other will admit her assistants to ample freedom—but only after a period of testing and supervision in each new responsibility. And even then, the Director's eye is keen to observe errors, or instances where her tactful personal interposition may encourage difficult accounts to continue or expand their patronage.

Mrs. Reid's activities were not confined to advertising in its narrow sense. Strictly, that is the province of the Advertising Manager. The news sections of a newspaper are its fundamental reasons for being, and, apart from certain differences in style and emphasis, the rules of news-hunting are the same in all the press. It is in the features, chiefly, that the newspaper of today takes on that special characteristic which has been mentioned as appealing to advertisers—distinct, concentrated coverage. Thus features as well as promotion work in general are of importance to the advertising department, and Helen Rogers Reid has had much to do with shaping the course of this considerable branch of the *Tribune's* work. Since her husband's interest centered about the editorial department, the effect of the loyal confidence and coöperation, the intimate personal relationship, between Editor and Advertising Director, has been a remarkably coherent newspaper.

The concept of an intelligent family newspaper requires an appeal to all members of the family. That this business concept permits the inculcation of an enlightened and practical feminism, was, of course, a fact which pleased Mrs. Reid greatly, and both the columns of the *Tribune* and the personnel of the paper bore witness to her interest in this phase of the work. Yet probably the finest part of the *Tribune's* activity in that direction has been the unobtrusiveness with which it has been done. Militant feminism, as expressed in daily journalism, so often tends to concentrate on distinctions of sex that its effect is to defeat the main purpose of attaining professional and intellectual equality. At the hands of men, this militancy usually sounds patronizing, at the hands of women, bumptious. Certain items, such as news of the women's clubs, tend to be distinctly feminine, but the *Tribune* under Mrs. Reid avoided the sentimentality of such designations as the "Only Woman's Page" of the 'nineties.

The *Herald Tribune* of today shows the results of this policy. It

is a principle of the paper not to use "canned" matter in its pages. The *Tribune* Home Institute was founded in 1915 as a laboratory to test and experiment with recipes and utensils for the home, instead of merely serving as a clearing house for information submitted by readers or advertisers. The Institute is still flourishing, providing, in addition to the above, food market reports and the like. In a similar manner, fashions are illustrated by *Herald Tribune* designers, and, to emphasize the family idea, men's styles and furniture are included in the department. Gardening (not wholly a feminine occupation by any means) is fostered by an information service and an annual home garden competition. Women's club activities are given considerable space, and the *Herald Tribune* has, since 1930, fostered an annual conference to correlate the activities of the clubs. This Conference on Current Problems was the idea of Mrs. William Brown Meloney, editor of *This Week*, the syndicated successor to the *Herald Tribune Magazine*, and has had remarkable success. In 1934, 38,000 women applied for admission. The method of procedure is to select a general topic and invite leaders in various fields to discuss its implications. For example, in 1934 Mrs. Meloney presided over a meeting of five sessions as some 50 speakers discussed "Changing Standards." Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt opened the forum, and her husband closed it. Two Cabinet members and many leaders of thought here and abroad contributed, two of them by radio from London.

In the family paper, the children cannot be neglected. The *Tribune*, however, has made little direct appeal to the sub-adolescent. In the daily edition, there has been no comic strip except the domestic comedies of Briggs and Webster—mature features. Instead, a brief illustrated story by Thornton W. Burgess was furnished for the youngest element. The Sunday comic section has seen many changes. After the disappearance of the original venture in 1915 there were no Sunday Comics for several years. The Gravure Section was printed in colors during 1919, accompanied by a page of jesting rhyme from the pen of Grantland Rice and illustrated by Jay N. Darling. This promising feature shortly vanished, replaced in April, 1920, by a regular four-page colored comic section, this time organized by the *Tribune's* own syndicate. Eventually, after the purchase of the *Herald*, this was expanded to eight

pages. Even here, however, the domestic comedy type predominated, with but a small proportion of distinctly children's features. Taken as a whole, the *Tribune's* Sunday comics have probably been the most mature of that class of feature.

The most interesting part of the process of reorienting the *Tribune* after 1918 was in relation to the critical departments. There was less of change than consistent development—the old *Tribune* had been well provided for in that respect. The dramatic criticism of the paper had been in a state of flux since 1913. In that year, Arthur Ruhl became critic, but the outbreak of war called him away the following year to act as foreign correspondent. Hector Turnbull took his place for a year, when that versatile journalist, Heywood Broun, was given the task of reviewing plays. Broun's tenure, interrupted by various other duties, such as his trip to France, lasted until 1921. He was a highly entertaining critic, with a gift for phrase-making and a love for controversy. The former secured a large following, but the latter involved numerous battles with producers and actors and at least one libel suit.

When Broun left the *Tribune* in 1921 to go to the *World*, Percy Hammond, dramatic critic of the *Chicago Tribune*, was brought in as his successor. Hammond became extremely popular in New York. He was not dogmatic but possessed a sound and sympathetic taste for the theater, expressed in delicate prose. His death in 1936 evoked a tribute from his colleagues that was unique in its unanimity.

One branch of dramatic criticism which came into being during the second decade of the present century dealt with the cinema. For many years, Harriette Underhill reviewed the screen output for the *Tribune*. Her successor was Richard Watts, Jr., a temperate judge with an abiding interest in the social significance of his subject, who is now theater critic.

Henry Krehbiel, the veteran music critic, died in 1923. Lawrence Gilman, critic of art, music and literature of the historic *North American Review*, has proved a worthy choice for the vacant place. Originally interested in painting, Gilman is self-taught in music. He was with Harper's for many years, acting as managing editor of the *Weekly* for a time, before passing to the *Review*.

The greatest changes in the technique of criticism on the

Tribune have occurred in the field of literature. In 1913, Royal Cortissoz gave over literary criticism to devote himself to art and to his work on Whitelaw Reid's papers. For some time thereafter the methods of reviewing books continued to follow familiar lines. Once a week, usually on a Wednesday, a two-page section was devoted to books, which were usually reviewed by members of the staff. Willis Fletcher Johnson, literary editor after 1917, was assisted principally by Frederick F. Van de Water and Heywood Broun. Some time in 1919, the latter suggested a more frequent treatment and was given a triweekly column in which to cover the current literary output. The column was headed simply *Books*. One day, finding nothing of importance from the publishers, Broun, with much trepidation, submitted an essay on househunting in Connecticut. Garet Garrett received the innovation with enthusiasm and authorized similar personal sketches whenever the supply of books was low. With an ever-increasing volume of accounts of the Broun dog, the Broun small son and the Broun household generally, the title of the column became a misnomer, and was altered to *Books and Things*. Thus Heywood Broun was launched on his career as essay columnist, and a valuable feature was added to the *Tribune*. When Broun left the paper, F. F. Van de Water carried it on. It now appears daily in the *Herald Tribune*, but the present author, Lewis Gannett, is confined by an increased literary output to *Books* rather than *Things*.

In 1922, Burton Rascoe, then associate editor of *McCall's Magazine*, was called to the literary editorship of the *Tribune*. A progressive and enthusiastic commentator, he was given a new vehicle by the institution of the *Tribune Magazine and Books*, a Sunday center of literary comment, instead of a midweek issue of the daily. This was the most important step in creation of a really influential literary section. A department devoted wholly to book reviews was built up—including such familiar names as Isabel Paterson and Will Cuppy—and the *Tribune* had begun its campaign for recognition as an influence in American literature on the scale of modern journalistic enterprise.

Two years later, shortly after the purchase of the *Herald*, the book section was separated from the *Magazine* and issued as a separate publication—*Books*. Stuart P. Sherman, at the suggestion

of Royal Cortissoz, was summoned from the University of Illinois to become its editor. This dual event is regarded by Mrs. Reid as one of the great triumphs of the paper, and, indeed, the *Herald Tribune* almost at one bound became a leader in literary criticism. The reviewing staff was enlarged and specialists were invited to contribute. Enlarged space permitted more intensive and more extensive discussion. *Books* has been remarkably free from any trace of editorial bias in matters of political controversy—a freedom which the paper has maintained in all its critical departments—as well as from any pronounced alignment with a particular school.

Stuart P. Sherman died in 1926. At that time, Irita Van Doren, who had been his assistant since 1924, was chosen as literary editor and has progressively increased the influence of *Books*.

The columnist is vaguely related, by his literary flavor, to the book reviews. In 1923, Franklin P. Adams took his *Conning Tower* to the *World*, and Don Marquis came in his place, bringing Archy, the *vers libre* cockroach, and Mehitabel (*toujours gai*). During Marquis's vacations, Edward Hope, a young man whose more serious hours were then spent in an advertising office, substituted. In 1925 Marquis left, and Hope became the regular columnist of the *Herald Tribune* until 1932, when F. P. A. returned.

In the editorial department, a more dispassionate tone was assumed after 1918. While Gareth Garrett remained managing editor, the warfare against Hearst was kept up for a time, as well as a "campaign of education" on the treaty issues. But, as has been shown in the previous chapter, the country as a whole was wearied of strenuous preaching. Furthermore, as a matter of newspaper policy, strident campaigns that infringe on the news columns are apt to alienate readers in the long run. Gradually the *Tribune* banished its opinions to the editorial page, and tempered them to the calmer atmosphere of peace.

Garrett left the *Tribune* in November, 1919, and was succeeded by George M. Smith, former managing editor of the *Sun*. Smith died in office after little more than a year. William O. McGeehan, who followed Smith, resigned in February, 1922, and Julian Mason left the *Chicago Evening Post* to take his place. Mason, a staunch Republican, later editor of the *New York Evening Post*, was managing editor until 1926. His term included the absorption of the

Herald, wherein he acquitted himself with great credit.

The post-war period saw a renewed interest in local news. Stanley Walker in his book, *City Editor*, writes:

Fifteen years ago, before most of the mergers, the *Herald*, *Sun*, *Tribune*, *World*, *American* and *Times* set apart each night an average of eighteen or twenty columns of space for local news; today, the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* may devote from twenty-five to forty-five columns to the same class of material, and on most nights Mr. Hearst's *American* will have almost as much local news space. Fifteen years ago a morning newspaper might have only forty local items day after day; it is not unusual now for a paper to have 100 local items, some of them illustrated with photographs which would not have been attempted even ten years ago. Fifteen years ago all society news and the obituaries could be printed on the same page; now at least two pages are required on such papers as the *Times* and *Herald Tribune*.¹

The trend, then, is similar to that following the Civil War and has resulted in increased responsibility for the city editor. From the departure of Robert MacAlarney in July, 1916, until the purchase of the *Herald* in 1924, the *Tribune* had as city editors, Arthur R. Fergusson, Neal Jones, Percy T. Edrop, Hood MacFarland, and Dwight S. Perrin. Perrin, a graduate of the hard school of Chapin, was in charge of the city desk from March, 1923, until July, 1926, with the exception of two months in 1924 when Fred Edwards substituted for him.

As the *Tribune* increased in size and circulation, it taxed the facilities afforded by the old building on Park Row. Half a century of service had left the Tall Tower still sound but quite inadequate to the necessities of a swiftly growing newspaper. The press was rapidly deserting Newspaper Row. The *Sun* had moved to Broadway and Chambers Street, the *Herald* to the junction of Sixth Avenue and Broadway, and the *Times* was farthest North on West Forty-Third Street. The *Tribune* management began to lay plans for a new building which should be abreast of its development.

In 1921, construction was begun on a site on West Fortieth Street, between Seventh and Eighth Avenues. The whole of the seven-story building was planned expressly for newspaper work, and it was hoped that it would provide for twenty years of normal growth. In design, the new plant was simple but effective, indeed,

in a technical sense, revolutionary. It made no pretence to architectural grandeur but strove for the utmost efficiency in operation.

In the older newspaper offices, the news rooms were usually somewhere in the center of the building, with composing rooms above and the presses in the basement. The normal progress of copy under this arrangement was wasteful of time and energy—proceeding up several floors to the composing rooms, then, in the form of plates, descending to the basement, whence the heavy finished product had to be hoisted to street level for distribution.

In the new *Tribune* building, the gravity system was employed throughout. Offices of administration, advertising and the like were situated on the two uppermost floors. The editorial and news rooms were on the fifth floor. Copy originating on these upper floors was sent by gravity to the fourth floor, where it was set up on linotypes and the stereotype plates cast. These in turn went to the presses in a huge “duplex” room, taking up the second and third stories. The printed and folded sheets went on down to the ground floor where trucks stood ready to carry them to newsstand and railway station. The basement was used only for the heating plant and storage purposes—a great boon to the pressmen.

The new building was occupied in 1923, a proud moment for the Reids. Their policy was rapidly justifying itself, as a circulation of 137,000 testified. The paper's new home was not the gesture of defiance that the Tall Tower had been, it was a conservative and necessary change. How conservative, the events of the succeeding year were to prove.

Meritorious as the *Tribune* formula might claim to have been, it had supplied only a part of the paper's success. A very practical assistance had come from the logic of the economic situation of the New York press and from the dealings of a man who applied to that situation a technique new in American journalism. From this technique the *Tribune* had already profited greatly, and was destined to profit even more.

When Ogden Reid became managing editor in 1912, there were seven principal morning dailies in New York City. The strongest were three Democratic papers, the *Times*, the *World* and the *American*. The *Times* was still crescent, with its greatest days ahead, but already Adolph Ochs had made it the most profitable conservative

paper in the city. The *World*, with Joseph Pulitzer dead but two years, had passed its grand climacteric, but was still influential under Ralph Pulitzer and Frank Cobb. The *American* was great in circulation, lavish of expensive features (it was Hearst's favorite paper) but with less influence and revenue than its mass distribution warranted. All three papers were progressive in a journalistic sense, and healthy financially.

The four Republican papers were in far worse shape. The *Tribune's* situation has been discussed at length. The *Sun*, ably written, was in the shadow of Dana's passing. It was owned by William C. Reick, an old *Herald* man, and edited by Edward P. Mitchell much in the style of the period of its greatest glory—which had passed. The *Press* had little in the way of tradition to support itself. Probably the most sensational of the Republican papers, with Ervin Wardman, a forceful leader-writer as editor, it was in imminent danger of extinction. Strongest of the group was the *Herald*, but, edited after James Gordon Bennett's peculiar fashion from Paris, it was losing ground.

None of this group had as yet made any serious effort to meet the competition of the Democratic papers in innovation and, politically, the Republicans were outnumbered in the city. It was a foregone conclusion that some must go to the wall.

The characteristic process whereby such a situation had been adjusted in New York City was a gradual growth of the more vigorous papers at the expense of their weaker competitors until the latter died of inanition. There had been mergers, to be sure, such as the union of the *Morning Courier* with the *New York Enquirer* in 1829, which combination (plus the original *New York American*) was absorbed by the *World* in 1861. But in 1912 a series of mergers began on a wholly unprecedented scale, the work of a business man in journalism.

Frank A. Munsey came to New York from Maine with little capital. In 1882, he began a children's magazine, the *Golden Argosy*, and with infinite pains developed it into a successful adult publication, the *Argosy*. Then he began publication of *Munsey's Magazine* and with the profits branched into banking, chain groceries and other mercantile pursuits. All flourished, and Arthur Brisbane's own concise résumé of his career—"forty dollars, forty

years, forty millions"—might have stood as a sufficient epitaph had Munsey not ventured into daily journalism.

"There is no business," he said in 1908, "that cries so loud for organization and combination as that of newspaper publishing. The waste under existing conditions is frightful and the results miserably less than they could be made. For one thing, the number of newspapers is at least 60 per cent greater than we need."²

This contention may be attacked on sentimental grounds; it may be argued with much justice that, as the number of newspapers decreases, the chances of cultural and political standardization increase. But undoubtedly the journals which survived Munsey's ruthless "merchandizing" have benefited by the process, both economically and in the brand of news and features which increased prosperity enabled them to purchase. The *Herald Tribune* is sufficient proof thereof.

Munsey's adventures in New York journalism began with his purchase of the *Press* in 1912, for \$1,000,000. On June 30, 1916, he paid \$2,468,000 for the *Sun* and the *Evening Sun*, merging the *Press* with the former. James Gordon Bennett died on May 14, 1918, and after two years of trustee management, the Bennett properties—the *Herald*, with its Paris edition, and the evening *Telegram*—were sold to Munsey for \$4,000,000. The transfer was announced on January 14, 1920, the morning papers appearing for a time under the title *The Sun and New York Herald*. On October 1, 1920, the owner, who had assumed the personal editorship of the paper, killed the *Evening Sun* and issued the old *Sun* as an evening paper. Thus, by 1924, the *Herald* and the *Tribune* were the only Republican morning newspapers in the city of New York, with circulations of about 175,000 and 140,000 respectively.

The *Herald* and the *Tribune* appealed to a very similar clientèle and Munsey did not relish the idea of competition. The *Tribune* had grown steadily, profiting more by Munsey's mergers than did his own properties. He approached the Reids, offering them the alternative of selling their paper or buying his. The former suggestion was not even entertained, but the latter seemed attractive, and negotiations were begun for the transfer of the *Herald*. The only difficulty which arose was due to a testamentary provision of James

Gordon Bennett that the name of the *Herald* be preserved, which Munsey was bound to respect and the Reids rather reluctant to concede. Eventually the point was granted, however, and, for \$5,000,000, the Tribune, Inc., became possessed of the *Herald* and its Paris edition. On March 19, 1924, the sale was announced.

There are two points of primary interest in this transaction. The first is that, while the paper had become the *Herald Tribune* on its masthead, it was the old *Tribune* still—in aims, management and personnel. Changes inevitably resulted from the merger, but they were consistent with the development since 1912. There were accretions from the *Herald* staff; W. O. McGeehan, for instance, reappeared as a sports writer (though his connection was with the Syndicate) and a promising rewrite man, Stanley Walker, was transferred from Herald Square to Fortieth Street. For a time, also certain syndicated *Herald* features were continued, particularly in the comic section. But broadly speaking, the *Tribune* acquired from the *Herald* a name, a file of newspapers and—125,000 circulation.

For the second important aspect of the purchase was the remarkable success of the *Herald Tribune* in holding its joint circulation. Munsey had been consistently unfortunate in this respect, losing much of what he had bought to the *Times* or the *Tribune*. When the *World* disappeared in 1931, a large segment of its circulation vanished in thin air, benefiting no one. But the *Herald Tribune's* circulation in 1925 was 275,312, clear proof both of Munsey's wisdom in selling out, and of the skill with which the new amalgam was conducted.

The effect of this sudden increase upon the *Herald Tribune* has been twofold. In the first place it could be conducted on a sound economic basis. The *Tribune's* budget, despite the gain in circulation since 1912, had never really been balanced. Now, almost overnight, the *Herald Tribune* was removed from the endowed class and could be made to pay its own way. It is true that the fiscal condition of the *Herald Tribune* remains peculiar in that the paper is not primarily an institution for profit. Nevertheless, to the Reids, the economic well-being of the paper is a measure of their success in producing a thing of value to reader and advertiser. The *Herald Tribune* is conducted, therefore, on business principles, with less apparent sentiment than is exhibited in many establishments of

more utilitarian background.

The second effect of the increased revenue has been a modification of the idea of class circulation. While the suburban element remains strong in the *Herald Tribune* subscription list, a circulation of nearly 350,000 (in 1934) is a definite approach to "mass." While the same general line of development was followed which had been begun in 1918, namely an adaptation of the *Times* policy, with more attention to grace of presentation and entertainment values, the process of eliminating partizanship was speeded up. A good share of the credit for the progress made by the *Herald Tribune* in this and other respects must go to Arthur Draper, who was made Assistant Editor in 1925, and remained until 1933, when he became editor of the *Literary Digest*. Draper's tolerance and kindness won him the loyalty of the staff, while his high standards of newspaper service had an appreciable effect in increasing the esteem in which the lusty descendant of Greeley's *Try-bune* was held by the community it served.

CHAPTER XIX

SEVENTY YEARS LATER

THE history of a dynamic institution cannot be brought to that logical close which might be applied to a study of the reign of the Shepherd Kings of Egypt. The *Herald Tribune*, despite the century of tradition which lies behind the name, is in full vigor; all that can be done by way of terminating the chronicle is to depict the organization which produces it in 1936.

The present official address of the paper is 230 West Forty-First Street. The sudden increase in circulation flowing from the purchase of the *Herald* found the Fortieth Street plant inadequate, and in 1925 a twenty-story addition was constructed on an adjoining site facing on the next street. The gravity system and the arrangement of the first seven floors was retained, but with additional space in each floor. Four more stories were made available for the needs of the paper and the remaining nine stories were rented out.

The severely utilitarian design of the 1923 structure is even more apparent in the addition. The only concessions are involuntary, a series of setbacks which breaks up the tall, narrow façade. Two-thirds of the street floor front are occupied by a truck entrance, with the remainder devoted to a small circulation and advertising office and an unpretentious doorway. Round lighting fixtures across this front, labeled *Herald Tribune*, give the only clue to the function of the building.

This businesslike absence of bric-à-brac is the predominant characteristic of the interior arrangements as well. Everything is as trim, neat and unassuming as a filing cabinet. The visitor looks in vain for the modern magnificence of the *News* building or the sober elegance of the *Times's* paneled walls.

The official seat of authority in the *Herald Tribune* is a large room on the northeast corner of the fifth floor. Fitted in Georgian style, light and airy, with a portrait of Whitelaw Reid over the fireplace, it is the office where Ogden Reid, President of the New York

Tribune, Inc., and editor of the *Herald Tribune*, administers his charge.

The Tribune, Inc., lineal descendant of the Tribune Association, of the firm of Greeley and McElrath and of Horace Greeley and Co., owns the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *Paris Herald*, the Tribune Syndicate and the Tribune News Service as well as the real estate which pertains to these organizations. It is also, technically, the publisher of the newspapers. The corporate form is that adopted in 1878; 200 shares of a par value of \$10,000 each. Of the stock, Ogden Reid personally owns a clear and sure majority and, besides the family, there are only a very few stockholders. Among the latter may be mentioned Inez Cheney, a descendant of Silas Cheney, Greeley's brother-in-law, whose shares represent the last of the Greeley interest. The officers of the corporation are, in addition to Ogden Reid, Helen Rogers Reid, First Vice President, Howard Davis (Business Manager of the *Herald Tribune*), Second Vice President, Robert Cresswell, Treasurer and Harold L. Cross, Secretary. Mr. Cross is an expert on the law of libel, an occasional correspondent of the paper and the *Herald Tribune's* counsel.

When the press of business or social engagements calls Ogden Reid from the office, he is represented by Wilbur Forrest. Since the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, Forrest has had an interesting and varied career which he has depicted in his volume of reminiscences, *Behind The Front Page*. From 1919 to 1921 he was in Mexico and Haiti. He then returned to France as regular Paris correspondent, remaining for six years, scoring notable successes in covering the Lindbergh and Byrd transatlantic flights. In 1927 he was made Washington correspondent; went on to the Far East on the trail of a war scare in 1929, and in 1931 came to the New York office. In his role of Executive Assistant to the President, Forrest receives all correspondence, keeps in touch with his agile chief and in general acts as a buffer between Reid and the swarm of calls which are inflicted upon the editor. He is not Assistant Editor, but Mr. Reid's personal assistant, a task in which his knowledge of the paper, his loyalty to its head and his unfailing geniality and patience stand him in good stead.

The principal reason for the existence of the Tribune, Inc., is, of course, the *Herald Tribune*. The work of preparing and distrib-

uting this publication falls into two rough divisions, corresponding to the duties of the old-time editor and publisher. No very sharp definition of these spheres is possible, and even the technical differences are apt to be confusing, since, as has been noted, the corporation is legally the publisher of the paper. In a very general way it may be said that Ogden Reid's special attention has been given to the editorial side, while Helen Rogers Reid has interested herself in the functions of publishing. Actually, of course, the editor-in-chief has full authority over all departments.

The editorial side of the paper is concerned with the production of news and editorials, activities which are now the responsibility of the managing editor and chief editorial writer respectively. The two department heads function separately, with no joint official conferences, although naturally there are frequent discussions and harmonious understanding between them. The object of this separation is to ensure as far as possible the impartiality of the news columns, and, while it is almost impossible to expect a complete lack of bias, such partizanship as exists in news reports does so despite a sincere policy to the contrary.

The editorial page has seen a renewed public interest in its pronouncements during the last few years, when government and politics have had such intimate relationship with the bread and butter of millions of Americans. The chief editorial writer of the *Herald Tribune* since 1924 has been Geoffrey Parsons, no stranger in these pages. His staff of assistants includes Nicholas Roosevelt, former Minister to Hungary, Walter Millis, author of *The Martial Spirit*, editorial writer on the *Baltimore News*, the *New York Sun*, *Globe* and, since 1924, *Herald Tribune*, and E. H. Collins, Associate Financial Editor of the paper, who, in addition to a weekly signed column, contributes most of the editorials on financial or economic subjects. For editorials on sports, art or science, outside authorities or members of other departments in the paper may be called upon. Occasionally Ogden Reid will write a leader on a subject of particular importance.

Formal editorial conferences on matters of policy are seldom held, though individual consultations with Mr. Parsons or the editor-in-chief are frequent. Important changes of policy are not imposed from above in Caesarian fashion, since that is quite for-

eign to Mr. Reid's temperament. Instead, they are threshed out in informal discussions across a luncheon table or desk and each writer is given ample opportunity to express his ideas. The continuity of *Herald Tribune* policy is maintained by a generally like-minded staff rather than by enforced regimentation or even that strong moral control which Whitelaw Reid exerted. Considerable freedom of choice is exercised by the writers in their selection of topics. Each man is a specialist and treats of his own field—Nicholas Roosevelt, for instance, is obviously equipped to discuss the affairs of Central Europe. The specialization of editorial writing has not reached the point, however, where the man of training outside of journalism is preferred over the reporter. The editorial page is still visualized as the focus of the news, and the reportorial staff is closely scanned for possible talent.

The southern end of the fifth floor in the *Herald Tribune* building is devoted to news, the province of Grafton Stiles Wilcox, managing editor. Mr. Wilcox was Washington correspondent for sixteen years, for the Associated Press, the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Herald Tribune*. In 1926 Julian Mason became editor of the *Evening Post*, the late Armstead R. Holcombe, the colorful and temperamental night editor, became managing editor and Wilcox came to New York as his assistant. When Holcombe left in 1931 to edit his own *Eastern Shore Times* at Berlin, Maryland, Wilcox took his place.

The organization of newsgathering on the *Herald Tribune* is efficient and complete. The bulk of the spot news, domestic and foreign, is supplied by the Associated Press and the United Press, to both of which the paper subscribes. When the services of the local City and Standard News Associations are added, plus the paper's own large staff, it is found that some 25,000 people are employed at a cost of over \$20,000,000 a year to furnish *Herald Tribune* readers with the news.

In 1935, the foreign establishment of the *Herald Tribune* underwent an important reorganization. Until that year, London had been the center of all the European bureaus. The manager there was directly responsible to the managing editor, transmitting all orders and special assignments to the Continental offices. All European news dispatches went first to London, where they were relayed

by cable to New York.

This system had many advantages. London was a good news center; it was easy to make arrangements with the local press to cover all of Europe in an emergency. Then, too, it was generally cheaper to wire by way of London than to cable direct from Continental points. And by sending through London, the flow of news could be regulated to suit the needs of the paper.

Developments after the war, however, caused an alteration in the set-up. The first was the increased use of the telephone. This method was faster, surer, and less liable to censorship than the telegraph, and its natural European center was Paris. Then the Press Wireless, a coöperative radio station, was organized by American newspaper services in Paris. It now became cheaper to use this station than to cable by way of London. Paris, rather than London, tended to become the American news capital of Europe.

A third reason for changing Smalley's system was the growth of the *Herald Tribune's* Paris edition. The *Paris Herald* had been founded by James Gordon Bennett to provide a newspaper for his countrymen abroad. It languished for many years, but, with the war, the strong tide of Americans setting in toward Paris brought prosperity. The *Paris Herald* was included in Munsey's purchase of the Bennett properties, and was offered by him, along with the *New York Herald*, to the Reids. Ogden Reid was much interested in this acquisition, and encouraged its development.

During the war, the *Chicago Tribune* established a rival Paris edition. It lacked the prestige of the earlier journal, and finally succumbed by purchase to the *Herald* in 1934. The latter thus returned to its unique status as the only American daily in Europe. Its organization is distinct from that of the *Herald Tribune*; it has its own editor, Laurence Hills, its own editorial staff, and maintains a New York correspondent.

The existence of this establishment, in a fine new building on the Rue de Berri, was a powerful argument in favor of moving the *Herald Tribune's* European center to Paris. Combined with the features mentioned before, the argument became irresistible. Early in 1935, therefore, John Elliott, long Berlin correspondent, was put in charge at Paris, and the change effected.

Under the new arrangement, London dispatches are cabled direct to New York, but all other European news goes through Paris. Three bureaus are maintained at Rome, Berlin and Moscow, with local correspondents at several other points. The rule of the *Herald Tribune* has been to employ only Americans as bureau heads, though native talent is frequently used in subordinate positions, or as provincial correspondents. In all foreign correspondence, interpretive writing is emphasized, as the staff abroad is intended to supplement and comment upon the routine news furnished by the press associations.

Outside of Europe, the *Herald Tribune* maintains permanent bureaus at Tokyo and Shanghai. The work of a number of local correspondents in Japan and China is directed through these offices.

In all, including the output of the press services, approximately 13,000,000 words of foreign news come into the *Herald Tribune* office in the course of a year, and about half of them appear in the paper. Most of them are cabled, arriving in the news room on the teletype. No transcription is necessary with this machine, and no time is lost between the sending station and the news room. Wilbur Forrest gives a striking example of the efficiency of the system in his account of the Lindbergh flight. By means of a private telephone wire from Le Bourget field to the cable office, and a previously prepared bulletin, the exact time that the *Spirit of St. Louis* touched French soil was flashed to New York before the wheels of the plane stopped rolling, and ahead of the report of any news service. A cable of congratulations was sent in reply to Forrest's office in the *Paris Herald* building.

It served to give the *Herald* its first news that Lindbergh had safely landed at Le Bourget. Of course, the *Herald* received this news after it had traveled to New York and back a distance of about seven thousand miles.¹

At the New York end, all cable dispatches are read and edited by the cable editor.

Domestic news is covered in much the same manner as foreign news—by the press associations, fixed bureaus at strategic points, local correspondents, and frequent special assignments. The permanent agencies include Washington, Albany and Chicago, with

the first of these leading in importance. After the death of Theodore C. Wallen, in 1935, Albert L. Warner became chief of the Washington bureau, with a staff including John O'Brien, E. K. Lingley and Joseph Alsop, Jr.

The work of the regular staff in interpreting national affairs is supplemented by a group of independent, syndicated commentators. Mark Sullivan writes from Washington; Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson from New York. It is a team which represents a wide variety of opinion, but a uniform standard of expression, in keeping with the *Herald Tribune's* avowed and generally successful policy of confining its own opinions strictly to the editorial page.

Domestic news (outside of New York and vicinity) is usually dispatched by telegraph and received on the teletype. In the office it is handled by the telegraph editor.

The city room is the heart of any newspaper. In the *Herald Tribune*, this large apartment, flanked on one side by the constantly clicking teletype office, and on the other by the library, with the city desk in the center, is meeting place for some hundred-odd reporters and rewrite men. Patrons of the scene are familiar with the scene—the many railed-off compartments, the thin haze of smoke, the apparent confusion. But no reproduction can convey the tension of the city room on the night of a big story, a close election or a major tragedy, when the teletypes are madly reeling off reams of grayish copy, when 'phones ring in all corners of the room, and the rattle of typewriters soars to a wild crescendo. This is the atmosphere that keeps the cub patiently at his uninspiring task of expanding petty obituaries, on the salary of an office boy.

At present (1936), Charles McClendon is city editor of the *Herald Tribune*. He succeeded Stanley Walker in January, 1935, when the author of *City Editor* went over to the *Mirror* as managing editor. Walker, one of the few men who have emerged from the obscurity which usually shrouds city editors, was in charge of the *Herald Tribune's* local news for six years, following Endicott Rich in that position.

As has been said, local news has increased in importance in the last fifteen years, though the exciting events of the past year abroad caused a temporary shift of emphasis to foreign news.

Rapidity of communication has widened the field of the city room; it is now expected to cover, as Stanley Walker points out, "all the news as far north as Albany in New York State, all of New Jersey and Connecticut."² Thus when the *Morro Castle* burned off Asbury Park, some sixty-five miles from New York, the city desk was able to spread reporters all up and down the Jersey shore before the blazing vessel was beached. This scope of activity gives variety to the work of the local reporter, beyond even the fascinating play of New York life, and many have found a satisfying career in the city room. Of course, it is also the logical starting place for feature writing and out-of-town assignments which may lead to the editorial page, to criticism, or to a glamorous post in the foreign service.

The local staff has undergone considerable specialization, being divided into many departments such as sports, finance, society, and so on. Even general reporters are usually assigned to a particular run—City Hall or the Federal Building. The departments have grown rapidly in size during recent years. Financial news, one of the oldest separate reportorial functions on the paper, is handled by a staff of thirty-five. Sports, one of the youngest, has twenty-nine. The drama, which William Winter covered alone or with a single assistant for forty years, now has nine persons to chronicle and criticize. Naturally the Library has kept pace with the growth of the paper. It includes a collection of reference works and standard authorities, the prepared obituaries which once gave the newspaper library its title of "the morgue," files of old papers stored in "the vault" on the eleventh floor and a great row of filing cases stored with clippings on almost every subject and personality of possible news interest. All information is cross-indexed and readily accessible. The major share of the credit for this efficient organization belongs to the present Librarian, D. G. Rogers, a veteran newspaperman who came from the *Times* to the *Tribune* in 1921. Mr. Rogers takes a fierce pride in his department and is continually on the watch for means of improving its equipment and of perpetuating the fleeting records of the present for the newspapermen to come.

The city room is the one section of the modern newspaper which specializes in spot news, and where "exclusive" stories are most

apt to break. The United Press and Associated Press are of little value to the city editor, but he is assisted in covering routine news sources, such as conventions and the minor courts, by the City News Association, a coöperative organization including all of the principal New York dailies except the *Mirror* and the *Morning Telegraph*. The City News confines its activities to Manhattan and the Bronx; the Standard News Association, a commercial agency, performs the same function for the rest of the city and the surrounding suburbs. The *Herald Tribune* has its own news service as well, selling to other papers.

The *Herald Tribune* Syndicate, managed at present by Harry Staton, has never attained the huge spread of such organizations as the King Features or the *Chicago Tribune* Features, but it includes a very high class type of material. One of its most celebrated *coups* occurred in 1929, when a brief daily comment was secured from Calvin Coolidge upon his retirement from the Presidency. A second was the acquisition of Walter Lippmann. It is for this type of feature that the *Herald Tribune* is best known, although its cartoons and comics have a certain popularity.

The editorial department of the *Herald Tribune* in 1934 employed some 350 persons, exclusive of the Syndicate and News Service which accounted for thirty-four more. A notable feature of the paper's personnel is the number of women in key positions—more than on any other metropolitan newspaper. Most of them are on the business side or in special departments, however—advertising, promotion, *Books*, *This Week*, home economics, fashions and so on, including Mrs. Reid herself; Mrs. Helen W. Leavitt, Mrs. Reid's invaluable assistant advertising manager; Elsa Lang, promotion director; Irita Van Doren, literary editor; Mrs. William Brown Meloney, veteran newspaper woman, former editor of the *Delineator* and, since 1926, editor of the magazine section; Esther Kimmel of the Home Economics Department and Fanny Fern Fitzwater, the affable Fashion Director. In the actual collection of news the proportion of women is smaller. There are none in the foreign service or the Washington bureau, and the city room now has only one woman doing general reporting—Emma Bugbee. The rest of the women on the fifth floor are engaged in specialized work—dramatic criticism, women's sports, the society

page (the society editor is a man, however) and as librarians or secretaries.

The process of printing the mass of information collected by the editorial department for the public is in charge of the mechanical superintendent, "that canny Scot," Archie Burns. The daily routine, in simple terms, is as follows: During the day, news, editorials, advertising and features go to the composing room on the fourth floor. Here about 340 men and seventy-five linotypes set up the copy and run it off on a proof press. At about 8 o'clock in the evening, Grafton Wilcox meets with the cable, telegraph, city and make-up editors, and the arrangement of the paper is determined upon. The *Herald Tribune* is justifiably proud of its make-up, which has thrice won the Ayer cup for its excellent appearance. No fixed system is followed: the idea is to adapt the pages to the character of the news. At times, a balanced make-up is used—the two chief stories of each day being placed at opposite sides of the page, with headlines and column depths of equal size. If there is one story of predominant interest, a "bracket" make-up is employed, throwing attention to the upper right hand corner of the front page. The inside pages are as carefully organized as the front page.

When the "dummy" paper has been made up from proofs, it is sent back to the fourth floor, and the type slugs arranged in accordance with it. These pass to the stereotypers, of whom there are about fifty in the *Herald Tribune*. Plates are cast and go down to the pressroom.

In this lofty apartment are fourteen presses—three decuple, nine octuple and two color presses—which can turn out thirty-two-page *Herald Tribune's* at the rate of 240,000 an hour or 4,000 a minute. Every sixty seconds more reading matter comes through the machines than was in the whole first edition of the *Tribune* ninety-three years ago. In fifteen minutes from the time that an edition reaches the stereotypers, the first copies will be printed and folded, ready for distribution.

Ordinarily, the first edition of the *Herald Tribune* goes to press at 11 P. M., and is followed by four later editions at 12 M., 1:30, 2:30 and 3:30 A. M. This schedule may be varied, of course, as circumstances require. On election night for example the paper is

on the streets by 10 P. M., and the number of editions is increased. The Sunday edition is printed piecemeal; the rotogravure (which is not printed in the *Herald Tribune* plant) is made up about two weeks ahead, the colored sections go to press three days ahead, the inside sections follow and the first news section is made up on Saturday night.

In 1868, Samuel Sinclair carried on the work of the present advertising, circulation and business departments with a staff of no more than thirty assistants. Today, of the 1,760 *Herald Tribune* employees, nearly half are engaged in this part of the paper's activities. The general reasons for this enormous growth of the publication office are obvious—the increasing value of advertising, larger circulation and the complexity of modern business organization. The personnel of the editorial side has also increased, to be sure, but efficiency of mechanical communication and the assistance of the press associations have tended to check the process, relatively.

Naturally, some of the expansion of the publication departments is quite recent and may be credited to the sudden rise in circulation after 1924. The circulation department was one of the first to feel the pressure. Kenelm R. Winslow, the present manager, has a staff of 145 under him, and there are over 200 employed in the mail and delivery rooms. The advertising department, on the other hand, began to increase in size when Mrs. Reid took it over. For instance, in 1918 national advertising was handled by only one man, which even then was an unsatisfactory arrangement. The whole advertising department at present consists of 155 persons.

The business office, of which Howard Davis is manager and Robert Cresswell assistant manager, has a tremendous task, compared with the similar service required in Sinclair's time. It includes the management of the building, the mechanical department and accounting. When it is considered that the annual budget of the *Herald Tribune* at depression rates is over ten times that of the inflated period of John Russell Young's managing editorship, with details of personnel, purchasing and administration complicated more than proportionately, the magnitude of the operations of the business office can be readily appreciated.

So much for a brief outline of the physical equipment behind

that *Herald Tribune* which any resident of the metropolitan area may purchase for 2¢ at the nearest newsstand. Of the paper itself little need be said, beyond the concise and modest summary which Stanley Walker has given:

The *Herald Tribune*, since it took its present name at the merger in 1924, has become a powerful paper; although Republican it has not been afraid to experiment, as in its engagement of Walter Lippmann at the death of the *World* to write an independent editorial feature. Its news, even its political news, is less biased than it once was. Its professional standing has grown rapidly. It is famous for its typographical excellence. It seeks complete coverage without becoming a dreary catalogue. It has faults, and touches of Tory choler now and then, but it is alive.³

It is alive, after a longer period of continuous ownership by one family than any of its competitors. It is approaching the century mark with every appearance of youthful vigor and full possibilities of triumphant development. The Reids have sustained the paper of Horace Greeley and brought it, changed in a changed world, to a position worthy of its traditions. It would seem that they may well be content with the manner in which they have administered their heritage.

NOTE ON SOURCES

INASMUCH as a large proportion of the information contained in this study has been obtained in conversation or by correspondence with members of the staff of the *Herald Tribune* or of the *Tribune*, it seems advisable to tabulate this assistance. No specific dates are given, since the conversations and correspondence in many cases spread over a period of years; however, it may be said that each occurred between 1931 and 1935.

Heywood Broun	Wilbur Forrest
Roscoe C. E. Brown	Daniel Frohman
A. Burns	Garet Garrett
Royal Cortissoz	W. O. McGeehan
George H. Daley	Geoffrey Parsons
Arthur S. Draper	Ogden Mills Reid
Helen Rogers Reid	

For documentary source material, the author has depended chiefly on newspaper files and printed collections. In addition, he has, through the kindness of Mrs. Gabrielle Greeley Clendenin and Mr. Henry A. Stahl, been permitted to make use of the collection of letters (copies and originals) of Horace Greeley, now in Mr. Stahl's possession. Mr. Robert Cresswell and A. V. Miller of the *Herald Tribune* have supplied valuable statistical and biographical material from the files of the Accounting Department of the paper, and Mr. Wilbur Forrest has assisted the author in searching the office records for information on the anti-sedition campaign of 1917-1918, as well as in securing data on the present newsgathering methods of the *Herald Tribune*. Finally, Mr. Royal Cortissoz's acquaintance with the Whitelaw Reid papers has been invaluable in obtaining and checking results.

The most prolific source of information has, of course, been the newspaper files. Many of these were consulted; only the more important are listed here.

The <i>American</i>	The <i>New York Herald</i>
The <i>Journal</i>	The <i>New York Herald Tribune</i>
<i>Harper's Weekly Magazine</i>	The <i>Sun</i>
The <i>Nation</i>	The <i>New York Times</i>
The <i>New York Evening Post</i>	The <i>New York Tribune</i>
The <i>World</i>	

REFERENCE WORKS

Dictionary of American Biography.
National Cyclopaedia of American Biography.

Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography.

N. W. Ayer and Son's *American Newspaper Annual and Directory*
(*Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals*).

George P. Rowell & Co.'s *American Newspaper Directory.*

Who's Who in America.

GENERAL WORKS

Adams, Henry. *Education of Henry Adams.* Boston and N. Y. 1918.

Alexander, De Alva S. *A Political History of the State of New York.*
N. Y. 1923 (3 vols.).

——— *Four Famous New Yorkers.* N. Y. 1923.

Anonymous: *Zachariah Chandler.* *Detroit Post and Tribune.* Detroit.
1880.

——— *The Greeley Record.* Union Republican Congressional Ex-
ecutive Committee. Washington. 1872.

——— *The New York Tribune: A Sketch of its History.* N. Y. 1883.

——— *The New York Tribune: Where and How it is Made.*
Phila. (?) 1876 (?).

——— *The Organization and By-Laws of the Tribune Association.*
N. Y. 1872.

——— *Proceedings at the Unveiling of a Memorial to Horace*
Greeley at Chappaqua, N. Y., Feb. 3, 1914. Albany, 1915.

Beale, Howard K. *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson & Re-*
construction. N. Y. 1930.

Beard, Charles A. & Mary R. *The Rise of American Civilization* (2 vols.)
N. Y. 1927.

Beer, Thomas. *Hanna.* N. Y. 1929.

Benton, Joel (ed.) *Greeley on Lincoln; With Mr. Greeley's Letters to*
a Lady Friend to Which are added Reminiscences of Horace
Greeley. N. Y. 1891.

Bigelow, John. *Retrospections of an Active Life.* (5 vols.) N. Y. 1909.

Bishop, Joseph Bucklin. *Notes and Anecdotes of Many Years.* N. Y.
1925.

——— *Theodore Roosevelt and his Times.* (2 vols) N. Y. 1920.

Blaine, James G. *Twenty Years of Congress.* (2 vols.) Norwich. 1886.

Bleyer, Willard G. *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism.*
Boston. 1927.

Bowers, Claude G. *The Tragic Era.* Indianapolis. 1929.

Brockway, Beman. *Fifty Years in Journalism.* Watertown. 1891.

Browne, Junius Henri. *The Great Metropolis.* Hartford. 1869.

Bullard, F. Lauriston. *Famous War Correspondents.* Boston. 1914.

Chambers, Julius. *News Hunting on Three Continents.* N. Y. 1921.

Congdon, Charles T. *Reminiscences of a Journalist.* Boston. 1880.

——— *Tribune Essays.* N. Y. 1869.

Conway, Moncure D. *Autobiography.* (2 vols.) Boston & N. Y. 1904.

- Cortissoz, Royal. *American Artists*. N. Y. & London. 1923.
- . *The Life of Whitelaw Reid*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1921.
- . *The New York Tribune: Incidents and Personalities in its History*. N. Y. 1923.
- Davis, Charles Belmont (ed.) *Adventures and Letters of Richard Harding Davis*. N. Y. 1917.
- Davis, Elmer. *History of the New York Times*. N. Y. 1921.
- Dennett, Tyler. *John Hay: From Poetry to Politics*. N. Y. 1933.
- Depew, Chauncey M. *My Memories of Eighty Years*. N. Y. 1922.
- Eckenrode, H. J. *Rutherford B. Hayes: Statesman of Reunion*. N. Y. 1930.
- Forbes, Archibald. *Memories and Studies of War and Peace*. N. Y. 1896.
- Forrest, Wilbur. *Behind the Front Page*. N. Y. 1934.
- Frothingham, Octavius Brooks. *George Ripley*. Boston. 1888. 6th ed.
- Fuess, Claude M. *Carl Schurz: Reformer*. N. Y. 1932.
- Furniss, Harry. *My Bohemian Days*. N. Y. 1919.
- Garber, K. Louise. *The Tribune Editorials of Isaac H. Bromley*. Ms. Essay, Columbia School of Journalism.
- Godkin, Edwin L. *Reflections and Comments*. N. Y. 1895.
- Gosnell, Harold F. *Boss Platt and His New York Machine*. Chicago. 1924.
- Greeley, Horace. *Recollections of a Busy Life*. (2nd ed.) with appendix. N. Y. 1873.
- (and H. J. Raymond) *Association Discussed; or the Socialism of the New York Tribune Examined*. N. Y. 1847.
- Haworth, Paul L. *The Hayes-Tilden Election*. Indianapolis. 1906.
- Hay, John. *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary*. Printed but not published. Washington. 1908.
- Haynes, Fred E. *Third Party Movements Since the Civil War*. Iowa City. 1916.
- Heaton, John Langdon, *The Story of a Page*. N. Y. & London. 1913.
- Holt, Henry. *Garrulities of an Octogenarian Editor*. N. Y. 1924.
- Hudson, Frederick. *Journalism in the United States*. N. Y. 1872.
- Huneker, James Gibbons. *Steeplejack*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1920.
- Ingersoll, Lurton D. *The Life of Horace Greeley*. Phila. 1890 (1873?).
- Keenan, Henry F. *The Money-Makers: A Social Parable*. N. Y. 1885.
- Krock, Arthur. *The Editorials of Henry Watterson*. N. Y. 1923.
- Lee, James Melvin. *History of American Journalism*. Revised Ed. Boston. 1923.
- Lewi, Isadore. *Long Ago: A Roster Regardless of Chronology*. N. Y. 1919.
- Linn, William Alexander. *Horace Greeley*. N. Y. 1903.
- Lodge, Henry Cabot. *Selections from the Correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge: 1884-1914*. N. Y. 1925.
- Maverick, Augustus. *Henry J. Raymond and the New York Press for Thirty Years*. Hartford. 1870.
- Merriam, George Spring. *Life and Times of Samuel Bowles*. (2 vols.)

N. Y. 1885.

Millis, Walter. *The Martial Spirit*. Boston. 1931.

——— *The Road to War*. Boston. 1935.

Mitchell, Edward Page. *Memoirs of an Editor*. N. Y. and London. 1924.

Muzzey, David Saville. *James G. Blaine*. N. Y. 1934.

Nevins, Allan. *American Press Opinion*. N. Y. 1928.

——— *Grover Cleveland: A Study in Courage*. N. Y. 1932.

——— *The Emergence of Modern America*. N. Y. 1927.

——— *The Evening Post: A Century of Journalism*. N. Y. 1924.

——— *Abram S. Hewitt: With Some Account of Peter Cooper*.

N. Y. 1935.

Oberholtzer, E. P. *Jay Cooke: Financier of the Civil War*. (2 vols.) Phila. 1907.

O'Brien, Frank M. *The Story of the Sun*. New Edition. N. Y. 1928.

Ogden, Rollo. *Life and Letters of Edwin Lawrence Godkin*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1907.

Osborn, Norris G. *Isaac H. Bromley*. New Haven. 1920.

Paine, Albert Bigelow. *Th. Nast: His Period and Pictures*. N. Y. 1904.

Parton, James. *The Life of Horace Greeley*. N. Y. 1855.

Paxson, Frederick L. *A History of the American Frontier: 1763-1893*. Boston. 1924.

Payne, George Henry. *History of Journalism in the United States*. N. Y. & London. 1925.

Pike, Albert. *First Blows of the Civil War*. N. Y. 1879.

——— *Horace Greeley in 1872*. N. Y. 1873.

Platt, Thomas Collier, *The Autobiography of Thomas Collier Platt*. N. Y. 1910.

Pringle, Henry F. *Theodore Roosevelt*. New York. 1931.

Reid, Whitelaw. *After the War: A Southern Tour, May 1, 1865-May 1, 1866*. N. Y. & London. 1866.

——— *American and English Studies*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1913.

——— *Ohio in the War: Her Statesmen Generals and Soldiers*. (2 vols.) Cincinnati. 1867.

——— *Some Newspaper Tendencies: An Address Delivered before the Editorial Associations of New York and Ohio*. N. Y. 1879.

Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley*. New Edition. N. Y. 1919.

——— *The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations*. N. Y. 1927.

Richardson, Albert Dean. *Garnered Sheaves from the Writings of Albert D. Richardson, Collected and Arranged by his Wife; To Which is Added a Biographical Sketch of the Author*. Hartford, 1871.

——— *The Secret Service, The Field, the Dungeon and the Escape*. Phila. 1865.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Autobiography*. N. Y. 1913.

——— *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*. N. Y. 1916.

- Rosewater, Victor. *History of Coöperative Newsgathering in the United States*. N. Y. 1930.
- Ross, Earle Dudley. *The Liberal Republican Movement*. N. Y. 1919.
- Russell, Charles Edward. *Blaine of Maine: His Life and Times*. N. Y. 1931.
- Salmon, Lucy. *The Newspaper and the Historian*. N. Y. 1923.
- Schurz, Carl. *Reminiscences*. (3 vols.) N. Y. 1908.
- Seitz, Don C. *The James Gordon Bennetts*. Indianapolis. 1928.
- *Horace Greeley*. Indianapolis. 1926.
- *Joseph Pulitzer: His Life and Letters*. N. Y. 1924.
- Smalley, George Washburne. *Anglo-American Memories* (2 vols.) London. 1911–1912.
- Smith, Ray B. (ed.) *History of the State of New York, Political and Governmental*. (6 vols.) Syracuse. 1922.
- Smith, Theodore C. *The Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield*. (2 vols.) New Haven. 1925.
- Stanwood, Edward. *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century*. Boston. 1903.
- *James G. Blaine*. Boston. 1905.
- Stedman, Laura (& Gould, George M.) *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1910.
- Stevens, G. A. *New York Typographical Union No. 6*. Albany. 1913.
- Sullivan, Mark. *Our Times*. (6 vols.) N. Y. 1926–1935.
- Swift, Lindsay. *Brook Farm: Its Members, Scholars and Visitors*. N. Y. 1900.
- Taussig, F. W. *The Tariff History of the United States*. N. Y. 1914.
- Thayer, William Roscoe. *Life and Letters of John Hay*. (2 vols.) Boston. 1915.
- Villard, Henry. *Memoirs*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1904.
- Walker, Stanley. *City Editor*. N. Y. 1934.
- Watterson, Henry. *Marse Henry*. (2 vols.) N. Y. 1919.
- White, Horace. *Life of Lyman Trumbull*. Boston. 1913.
- White, William Allen. *Masks in a Pageant*. N. Y. 1928.
- Wilkie, Franc B. *Pen and Powder*. Boston. 1888.
- Williams, Chas. R. *Diary and Letters of Rutherford B. Hayes*. Columbus, 1922–26.
- *The Life of Rutherford B. Hayes*. Boston & N. Y. 1914.
- Wilson, James H. *The Life of Charles A. Dana*. N. Y. 1907.
- Winkler, John K. W. R. *Hearst: An American Phenomenon*. N. Y. 1928.
- Winter, William. *Shakespeare on the Stage*. 1st Series. N. Y. 1911.
- *Vagrant Memories*. N. Y. 1915.
- Young, John Russell. (May D. Russell Young, ed.) *Men and Memories: Personal Reminiscences by John Russell Young*. N. Y. and London. 1901.
- Zabriskie, Frances Nicoll. *Horace Greeley, the Editor*. N. Y. 1890.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE

- ¹ Frederick L. Paxson, *A History of the American Frontier, 1763 to 1893*, p. 264.
- ² Ibid.
- ³ Quoted in W. A. Linn, *Horace Greeley*, p. 42.
- ⁴ Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, p. 137.
- ⁵ Quoted in Linn, *Horace Greeley*, p. 46.
- ⁶ James Parton, *The Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 326.
- ⁷ F. L. Bullard, *Famous War Correspondents*, pp. 406-408.
- ⁸ Mar. 2, 1856, in Joel Benton, *Greeley on Lincoln*, p. 124.
- ⁹ Apr. 9, 1856, in Benton, *Greeley on Lincoln*, p. 146.
- ¹⁰ Parton, *The Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 151.
- ¹¹ Lindsay Swift, *Brook Farm*, p. 276.
- ¹² Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, pp. 140-141.
- ¹³ Quoted in Parton, *The Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 239.
- ¹⁴ Greeley to C. A. Dana, Apr. 2, 1856, in Benton, *Greeley on Lincoln*, p. 141.
- ¹⁵ J. R. Young, *Men and Memories*, p. 115.
- ¹⁶ C. T. Congdon, *Reminiscences of a Journalist*, p. 234.
- ¹⁷ Young, *Men and Memories*, p. 114.
- ¹⁸ James H. Wilson, *The Life of Charles A. Dana*, pp. 160-170.
- ¹⁹ Linn, *Horace Greeley*, p. 187.
- ²⁰ Quoted in L. M. Salmon, *The Newspaper and the Historian*, p. 491.

CHAPTER TWO

- ¹ D. C. Seitz, *Joseph Pulitzer*, p. 125.
- ² J. S. Pike, *First Blows of the Civil War*, p. 260.
- ³ Amos Cummings in *Packard's Monthly Magazine*, quoted in L. D. Ingersoll, *The Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 476.
- ⁴ F. Hudson, *Journalism in the United States*, pp. 566-567.
- ⁵ Greeley to Mrs. Margaret Allen, Mar. 21, 1866, Stahl Collection.
- ⁶ Royal Cortissoz, *The Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 140.
- ⁷ G. W. Smalley, *Anglo-American Memories*, Series I, pp. 115, 135.
- ⁸ Henry Villard, *Memoirs*, pp. 211-213.
- ⁹ Carl Schurz, *Reminiscences*, vol. III, pp. 210-211.
- ¹⁰ Cummings in Ingersoll, *Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 462.
- ¹¹ Frank M. O'Brien, *The Story of the Sun*, p. 241.
- ¹² Cummings in Ingersoll, *Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 457.
- ¹³ Ibid., p. 464.
- ¹⁴ Royal Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 151.
- ¹⁵ Julius Chambers, *News Hunting on Three Continents*, p. 7.
- ¹⁶ G. W. Smalley, *Anglo-American Memories*, Series I, pp. 194-195.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 145-149.
- ¹⁸ Royal Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 162.
- ¹⁹ Victor Rosewater, *History of Coöperative Newsgathering in the United States*, pp. 127 ff.
- ²⁰ *New York Tribune*, April 10, 1861.
- ²¹ F. Hudson, *Journalism in the United States*, pp. 566-567 and Nevins, *Evening Post*, p. 360.

²² Royal Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 140.

²³ Chambers, *News Hunting on Three Continents*, p. 7.

CHAPTER THREE

¹ Lyman Abbott, *Reminiscences* (Boston & New York, 1923), p. 235.

² H. K. Beale, *The Critical Year*, p. 121.

³ *Messages and Papers of the Confederacy*, vol. I, p. 551.

⁴ *New York Times*, April 20, 1865.

⁵ Greeley to Mrs. Margaret Allen, April 12, 1865, Stahl Collection.

⁶ Greeley to Mrs. Margaret Allen, April 21, 1865, Stahl Collection.

⁷ Claude Bowers, *The Tragic Era*, p. 6.

⁸ Greeley to Mrs. Margaret Allen, Jan. 6, 1867, Stahl Collection.

⁹ Horace Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, pp. 414-415.

¹⁰ Greeley to Mrs. Whipple, Dec. 7, 1867, Stahl Collection.

¹¹ Young, *Men and Memories*, pp. 116-117.

¹² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 142.

¹³ Greeley to Charles B. Stoer, May. 10, 1868, Stahl Collection.

CHAPTER FOUR

¹ Cummings in Ingersoll, *Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 462.

² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 38-39.

³ E. P. Oberholtzer, *Jay Cooke*, vol. I, pp. 480-483.

⁴ Whitelaw Reid, *After the War*, p. 578.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 580.

⁶ W. F. G. Shanks, *How We Get Our News*, *Harper's Monthly Magazine*, May, 1867.

⁷ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 145. The blank in Mr. Cortissoz's volume refers to Young.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 239. The "sagacious observer" in Mr. Cortissoz's narrative was Waterson.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹¹ Greeley to W. L. Stone, Sept. 9, 1870. Stahl Collection.

¹² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 170-171.

¹³ C. B. Davis (ed.), *Adventures and Letters of Richard Harding Davis*, p. 199.

¹⁴ Whitelaw Reid, *Some Newspaper Tendencies*, pp. 25 ff.

¹⁵ Chambers, *News Hunting on Three Continents*, p. 32.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

¹⁷ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 188.

¹⁸ Chambers, *News Hunting on Three Continents*, pp. 2-3.

¹⁹ Hay to Nicolay, Dec. 12, 1870. *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from His Diary*.

²⁰ Tyler Dennett, *John Hay*, p. 91.

²¹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 166.

CHAPTER FIVE

¹ Beale, *The Critical Year*, pp. 225, 229.

² Cortissoz, *The Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 190.

³ Bowers, *The Tragic Era*, p. 329.

⁴ Young, *Men and Memories*, p. 165.

⁵ J. S. Pike, *Greeley in 1872*, p. 3.

⁶ Benton, *Greeley on Lincoln*, pp. 198-199.

CHAPTER SIX

¹ Mar. 13, 1872, Stahl Collection.

² Henry Watterson, *Marse Henry*, vol. I, p. 252.

³ Horace White, *Lyman Trumbull*, p. 356.

⁴ Watterson, *Marse Henry*, vol. I, p. 253.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 252.

⁶ G. S. Merriam, *Life and Times of Samuel Bowles*, vol. II, p. 187.

⁷ Watterson, *Marse Henry*, vol. I, p. 257.

⁸ To Lewis Mackenzie, May 22, 1872, Stahl Collection.

⁹ Cortissoz, *The Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 212.

¹⁰ *Zachariah Chandler*, pp. 312-313.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 315.

¹² D. S. Muzzey, *James G. Blaine*, p. 67.

¹³ To Mrs. Margaret Allen, July 9, 1872, Stahl Collection.

¹⁴ R. Brinkerhoff to E. Winchester, July 24, 1872, Stahl Collection.

¹⁵ Greeley to Mrs. Allen, Sept. 6, 1872, Stahl Collection.

¹⁶ *New York World*, quoted in Bowers, *The Tragic Era*, p. 391.

¹⁷ Watterson, *Marse Henry*, vol. I, p. 262.

¹⁸ Greeley to Mrs. Allen, Oct. 4, 1872, Stahl Collection.

¹⁹ Greeley to Mrs. Allen, Oct. 25, 1872, Stahl Collection.

²⁰ Greeley to Mrs. Allen, Nov. 4, 1872, Stahl Collection.

²¹ Testimony of Thomas Rooker, quoted in *New York Sun*, Dec. 19, 1872.

²² Cummings in Ingersoll, *Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 467.

²³ *New York Sun*, Nov. 30, 1872.

²⁴ John Bigelow, *Retrospections of an Active Life*, vol. V, pp. 88-89.

²⁵ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 238.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ J. B. Bishop, *Notes and Anecdotes of Many Years*, p. 24.

²⁸ Dennett, *John Hay*, p. 121.

²⁹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 247.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Dennett, *John Hay*, p. 122.

NOTE: The circumstances surrounding the death of Horace Greeley and the subsequent acquisition of the *Tribune* by Whitelaw Reid have been discussed in many works: by R. C. E. Brown in the third volume of *The History of New York State, Political and Governmental*, edited by Ray B. Smith, p. 147; Royal Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 243-248; Tyler Dennett, *John Hay*, pp. 121-122; Don C. Seitz, *Horace Greeley*, p. 398.

John Bigelow, in his *Retrospections of Many Years*, quotes passages from his diary in vol. V., pp. 89-90, giving Whitelaw Reid's account of some of the transactions. The *Sun* of November and December, 1872, prints most of the rumors current in New York City at the time, as well as full accounts of the testimony at the contest over Greeley's will, which is valuable for evidence as to Greeley's state of mind just before his death, and the condition of the office. The *Tribune* gives the "official" version of some portions of the episodes. The author has drawn on all of these sources, and has checked them in conversations with Mr. Brown, who received much of his information at first hand from the records of the Tribune Association and from Whitelaw Reid, and with Mr. Cortissoz, who has had full access to the Reid papers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

¹ Whitelaw Reid, *Some Newspaper Tendencies*, p. 31.

² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 249.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 301-302.

- ⁴ "Howard," in the *Philadelphia Times*, Aug. 7, 1878.
- ⁵ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 265, 370.
- ⁶ Reid, *Some Newspaper Tendencies*, pp. 25 ff.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-43.
- ⁸ "Howard," in the *Philadelphia Times*, Aug. 7, 1878.
- ⁹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 269.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 242.
- ¹¹ Harry Furniss, *My Bohemian Days*, p. 142.
- ¹² Chambers, *News Hunting on Three Continents*, pp. 101-106.
- ¹³ A. B. Paine, *Mark Twain*, vol. I, pp. 555-557.
- ¹⁴ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 307-308.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 309-311.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 249.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 304-305.
- ¹⁸ Reid, *American and English Studies*, vol. II, pp. 282-283.
- ¹⁹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 305.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

CHAPTER EIGHT

- ¹ In Hutchinson and Stedman, *A Library of American Literature* (vol. XI).
- ² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 321.
- ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-282.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 281.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 281-282.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 277.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 284.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 294.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 337.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 341.
- ¹¹ P. L. Haworth, *The Hayes-Tilden Election*, pp. 47-51.
- ¹² Reid, *American and English Studies*, vol. II, pp. 282-283.
- ¹³ Haworth, *Hayes-Tilden Election*, p. 270.
- ¹⁴ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, pp. 362-363.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 409.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 6.
- ¹⁷ Bigelow, *Retrospections of Many Years*, vol. V, p. 398.
- ¹⁸ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 418.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

CHAPTER NINE

- ¹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, pp. 288-289.
- ² Parton, *Life of Horace Greeley*, p. 395.
- ³ Cummings in Ingersoll, *Horace Greeley*, p. 475.
- ⁴ G. A. Stevens, *New York Typographical Union No. Six*, p. 386.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 387.
- ⁶ This contract was carried as a "standing head" in *The Boycotter*.
- ⁷ *New York Evening Post*, December 14, 1883.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁰ *New-York Tribune*, December 23, 1883.
- ¹¹ Stevens, *New York Typographical Union No. Six*, p. 388.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 391.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ For instance, neither Allan Nevins, in his *Grover Cleveland*, nor D. S. Muzzey

in his *James G. Blaine* mentions the Typographical Union as contributing to Blaine's defeat.

¹⁵ Stevens, *New York Typographical Union No. Six*, p. 392.

CHAPTER TEN

¹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. I, p. 391.

² A. B. Paine, *Th. Nast, His Period and Pictures*, pp. 486-487.

³ T. C. Smith, *Life and Letters of James Abram Garfield*, vol. II, pp. 1032-1034;

Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 35.

⁴ James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years in Congress*, vol. II, pp. 670-671.

⁵ Paine, *Th. Nast*, pp. 432 ff.

⁶ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 40.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

¹⁰ Bishop, *Notes and Anecdotes of Many Years*, p. 54.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 75.

¹³ *Letters of John Hay and Extracts from Diary*, vol. II, p. 67.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Bishop, *Notes and Anecdotes of Many Years*, pp. 55-56.

¹⁶ N. G. Osborn, *Isaac H. Bromley*, p. 33.

¹⁷ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, pp. 122-125.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

¹ Watterson, *Marse Henry*, vol. II, p. 234.

² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 198.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 201-202.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.

⁵ Rosewater, *History of Coöperative Newsgathering in the United States*, pp. 157-259.

⁶ J. G. Huneker, *Steeplejack*, vol. II, p. 147.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

⁸ See above, p. 29.

⁹ Huneker, *Steeplejack*, vol. II, p. 147.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Royal Cortissoz, *American Artists*, p. 3.

¹² Don C. Seitz, *Joseph Pulitzer, His Life and Letters*, pp. 416-418.

¹³ *Editor and Publisher*, July 21, 1934.

¹⁴ Rowell, 1888.

¹⁵ Cortissoz, *The New York Tribune: Incidents and Personalities in its History*, pp. 53-54.

¹⁶ *Editor and Publisher*, July 21, 1934.

¹⁷ *The New York Tribune; A Sketch of its History*.

CHAPTER TWELVE

¹ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 166.

² *Ibid.*, p. 169.

³ *New-York Tribune*, Mar. 10, 1910.

⁴ T. C. Platt, *Autobiography*, pp. 246-247.

⁵ Allan Nevins, *Grover Cleveland*, p. 611.

⁶ Seitz, *Joseph Pulitzer*, p. 196.

⁷ Platt, *Autobiography*, p. 267.

- ⁸ Ibid., pp. 257-258.
⁹ R. C. E. Brown, Vol. III, *History of New York State, Political and Governmental*, Ray B. Smith, ed., p. 399.
¹⁰ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 205.
¹¹ Ibid., p. 207.
¹² Ibid., p. 215.
¹³ Seitz, *Joseph Pulitzer*, p. 238.
¹⁴ James Creelman, *On the Great Highway*, pp. 177-178; John R. Winkler, *W. R. Hearst*, p. 144.
¹⁵ Reprinted in Reid, *American and English Studies*, vol. I, p. 107, passim.
¹⁶ Lodge, *Correspondence of Theodore Roosevelt and Henry Cabot Lodge*, vol. I, p. 206.
¹⁷ Platt, *Autobiography*, pp. 261-262.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

- ¹ The following account of the purchase and rejuvenation of the *Times* is from Elmer Davis, *History of the New York Times*, pp. 175-242.
² Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 301.
³ Ibid., p. 279.
⁴ Ibid., p. 293.
⁵ T. C. Platt, *Autobiography*, pp. 257-258.
⁶ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, pp. 300-301.
⁷ Archie Butt, *The Letters of Archie Butt* (L. F. Abbott, ed., N. Y., 1924), p. 77.
⁸ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 294.
⁹ N. W. Ayer and Son's *American Newspaper Annual and Directory*, 1911, 1913.
¹⁰ Cortissoz, *Life of Whitelaw Reid*, vol. II, p. 363.
¹¹ Alex McD. Stoddart, "Telling the Tale of the Titanic," *Independent*, May 2, 1914; quoted in Cunliffe and Lomer, *Writing of Today* (N. Y., 1925—4th edition), Confidential information.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

¹ Various attempts have been made in New York State to give statutory sanction to the old canon of journalistic ethics that the sources of news must be confidential. To date (Jan., 1936) these attempts have been unsuccessful. In 1935, Martin Mooney, of the *New York American*, was committed for contempt for refusing to violate this canon at the demand of a Grand Jury. Mooney's counsel maintained that the right of privileged communication should be extended to reporters. The Court of Appeals affirmed the contempt order, however, on the ground that the tendency of the law is to restrict the right rather than extend it by judicial interpretation. Statutory recognition of the right, as applied to reporters, exists in Maryland, New Jersey and Alabama. See the *New York Law Journal*, January 16, 1936.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

- ¹ See Mark Sullivan, *Our Times*, vol. IV, pp. 10-13.
² *N. Y. Tribune*, August 24, 1914.
³ Ibid., Sept. 7, 1914. See also Irvin S. Cobb, *The Glory of the Coming* (N. Y., 1918), p. ix.
⁴ Theodore Roosevelt, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*, p. 183.
⁵ Charles Willis Thompson, *Presidents I've Known and Two Near Presidents* (Indianapolis, 1929), p. 204.
⁶ George Creel, *The War, the World and Wilson* (N. Y. & London, 1920), p. 54.
⁷ Robert Benchley ("Guy Fawkes") "The Wayward Press," in the *New Yorker*, November 19, 1932.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

¹ The following account of the *Tribune's* campaign against sedition has been compiled from the files of the *Tribune*, *American* and *Journal*; from three volumes of clippings and office memoranda preserved in the *Herald Tribune* office; from *W. R. Hearst, an American Phenomenon*, by John K. Winkler; and from confidential information supplied by several who were members of the *Tribune* staff in 1918.

² Winkler, *W. R. Hearst*, p. 262.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 264-265.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

¹ Stanley Walker, *City Editor*, p. 52.

² Quoted in O'Brien, *The Story of the Sun*, p. 206.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

¹ Wilbur Forrest, *Behind The Front Page*, pp. 301-302.

² Stanley Walker, *City Editor*, p. 52.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

INDEX

- Abbot, Lyman, 41
 Adams, C. F., 107 f., 155, 156, 158
 Adams, C. F. Jr., 140 f., 150 f.
 Adams, F. P. ("F.P.A."), 291, 378
 Adams, Henry, 90, 145 f.
 Adams, J. Q., 107
 Adams, S. H., 296 f., 336 f., 342
 Advertising, methods in '60's, 36; man-
 uals in '70's, 124 f.; campaign for pu-
 rity in, 124 f.; concentrated coverage,
 371 f.; relation of features to, 374;
 department in *Herald Tribune*, 395
Ad-Visor, 296 f., 300
 "Agate" (Whitelaw Reid), 68 f.
Albion (N.Y.), 227
 Allen, Ethan, 155, 159
 Allen, Mrs. M., 113
 Allen, The, 80
 Alsop, Joseph Jr., 391
 Altgeld, J. P., 248, 255
American (N.Y.), 342 f., 345, 347, 349,
 379, 380 f.
American and Examiner (Chicago),
 291 f.
 American News Company, 344 f.
 Ames, Oakes, 111 f., 197
Anti-Slavery Standard, 56 f.
Argosy, 381
 Arthur, Chester A., 166, 195 f., 203 f.,
 213 f., 243
 Associated Press, 14, 22, 31, 33 f., 46,
 73 f., 107, 225 f., 278, 283 f., 305, 333,
 388, 393
 Ayer, J. C., estate of, 237
Ayer's Newspaper Annual, 237

 Babcock, S. D., 153
 Baez, Buenaventura, 92
 Baker, N. D., 338
 Barnard, C. I., 305
 Barrett, Leon, 235
 Bates, Edward, 20
 Bayard, T. F., 155
 Beach, M. S., 22

 Beale, H. K., 88
 Beecher, H. W., 82, 133
 Belknap, W. W., 153, 156
 Belloc, Hilaire, 305
 Benchley, Robert, 292, 324
 Benedict, Russell, 346
 Bennett, James Gordon, 3 f., 7, 10, 16,
 22, 72, 116
 Bennett, James Gordon Jr., 22, 130, 152,
 219, 235, 381 f., 389
 Bernstorff, Count von, 324
 Bigelow, John, 84, 122, 132, 136, 173
 Bingham, J. A., 111
 Bishop, J. B., 84, 119, 133, 135, 202, 221
 Bismark, Otto von, 32
 Black, F. S., 255, 262
Blade (Toledo), 22
 Blaine, James G., 58, 111 f., 120, 155 f.,
 164, 189 f., 194 f., 200, 207 f., 214 f.,
 217, 252, 274
 Blaine, John E., 112
 Blair, Frank, 65 f., 107
 Bliss, George, 249 f.
 Blowitz, O. de, 32, 131
 Blythe, S. G., 285
 Bond, W. E., 237
Books, 377 f., 393
 Borie, A. E., 90
 Boutwell, G. S., 90 f., 94, 101, 111, 147 f.
 Bowers, Arthur, 226
 Bowles, Samuel, 3, 102, 107 f., 156
Boycotter (see also *Union Printer*), 118,
 189 f.
 Brady, T. J., 170 f.
 Briggs, Clare, 291 f., 375
 Brisbane, Albert, 16 f.
 Brisbane, Arthur, 381 f.
 Bristow, B. H., 134, 153, 155 f., 158
 Brockway, Beman, 16, 105
 Bromley, I. H., 135 f., 150, 161 f., 210,
 220, 228
 Broun, Heywood, 279, 293 f., 334, 340 f.,
 344, 376, 377
 Brown, B. G., 102, 107 f.

- Brown, R. C. E., 221 f., 250, 274 f., 282, 287 f.
- Browne, J. H., 9, 26
- Bryan, W. J., 233, 254 f., 261, 263 f., 267, 273
- Bryant, W. C., 10, 23, 33, 62 f., 102, 108, 143
- Bugbee, Emma, 393
- Bullock, G. C., 169 f.
- Burchard, S. D., 211, 216
- Burdick, George, 81, 279, 289 f.
- Burgess, T. W., 375
- Burns, A., 394
- Butler, B. F., 41, 63 f., 101, 120, 149, 170, 234
- Butt, Archie, 277
- Cahan, Samuel, 336
- Calhoun, Mrs., 39
- Cameron, J. D., 149, 194
- Cameron, Simon, 26
- Carpenter, B. P., 204 f.
- Carpentier, Georges, 370
- Carroll, Howard, 205
- Carruth, Hayden, 220
- Casey, J. F., 100
- Cavour, Count di, 329
- Century Magazine*, 261
- Chamberlain, D. H., 164
- Chamberlain, G. E., 339
- Chambers, Julius, 79 f., 84
- Chamerauzan, M., 77
- Chandler, W. E., 160, 164, 170 f., 173, 213
- Chandler, Zachariah, 47, 101, 110, 160
- Chapin, C. E., 379
- Chase, S. P., 64 f., 70
- Cheney, Inez, 386
- Cheradame, André, 355 f.
- Cisneros, Evangelina, 234
- City News Association, 388, 393
- Clay, Henry, 8, 19
- Clemenceau, Georges, 329, 356 f.
- Clement, E. H., 83
- Cleveland, Grover, 190 f., 205, 209 f., 220, 223 f., 241 f., 252, 254, 256 f., 272, 279
- Cleveland, J. F., 25, 134
- Cobb, Frank, 381
- Cobb, Irvin S., 306
- Colburn, R. T., 9
- Colfax, Schuyler, 65, 111, 116, 120 f., 123
- Collins, E. H., 387
- Commercial* (Cincinnati), 22, 99, 102
- Commercial Advertiser* (N.Y.), 4, 117 f., 203
- Congdon, C. T., 16, 20, 142, 220
- Conkling, Roscoe, 96 f., 101, 104, 120, 149, 155, 164, 166, 194 f., 199 f., 203 f., 207 f., 243
- Conway, M. D., 9, 31, 77 f.
- Cook, Clarence, 27, 29, 33, 139 f., 231
- Cooke, Jay, 27 f., 70, 128
- Coolidge, Calvin, 278, 369, 393
- Cornell, A. B., 166, 174, 204, 243
- Cortissoz, Royal, 68 f., 142, 227, 231 f., 277 f., 278, 360, 377 f.
- Cortissoz, Mrs. Royal (Ellen Mackay Hutchinson), 142, 221, 231
- Courier* (Buffalo), 151
- Courier and Enquirer* (N.Y.), 4, 17, 381
- Courier-Journal* (Louisville), 102
- Cox, J. D., 150
- Cox, J. M., 369
- Cox, Sam., 150
- Coyle, J. F., 170, 173
- Craske, Charles, 34
- Crawford, F. S., 278
- Creel, George, 331
- Cresswell, Robert, 386, 395
- Creswell, J. A. J., 98
- Crocker, Richard, 263
- Croly, Herbert, 360
- Cross, H. L., 386
- Crowley, Richard, 200
- Crowther, Samuel, 355
- Cummings, A. J., 29, 83, 183, 228
- Cuppy, Will, 377
- Curtin, W. E., 81, 279, 289 f.
- Curtis, G. W., 174
- Czolgosz, Leon, 267
- Daily Chronicle* (London), 302
- Daily News* (London), 77 f., 302, 304
- Daily Telegraph* (London), 77
- Daley, G. H., 270 f., 292 f.
- Dalton, E. A., 304 f.
- Dana, C. A., on *Tribune*, 9 f., 16, 20, 23 f., 26; attack on J. R. Young, 72 f., 102; attacks on W. Reid, 117 f., 124 f., 189, 203, 251; and Associated Press,

- 225; supports Butler for presidency, 234; death, 269, 276
 Dana, Paul, 269
 Daniels, Josephus, 316, 317 f., 338
 Darling, J. N. ("Ding"), 294 f., 356, 366, 375
 Daugherty, H. M., 368
 Davis, David, 107 f., 162
 Davis, H. W., 42, 70
 Davis, Howard, 386, 395
 Davis, Jefferson, 44, 46, 54 f., 156
 Davis, Mrs. Rebecca Harding, 136, 139
 Davis, Richard Harding, 78, 302 f., 307
 Dawes, H. L., 111
 Day, Benjamin, 4 f., 7
 Debs, E. V., 220, 247
 Defrees, John, 121
Delineator, 393
Democrat (St. Louis), 71, 134
 Dempsey, Jack, 370
 Depew, C. M., 200, 215, 223, 238
 Dewey, George, 259
 Dickens, Charles, 11
 Dilke, Sir Charles, 77
 Dix, J. A., 151 f.
 Dorsheimer, William, 107
 Douglas, Stephen A., 20
 Doyle, Arthur Conan, 280
 Draper, Arthur, 278 f., 305, 333 f., 338, 344, 356, 371, 384
 Dreher, W. C., 356
 Dumba, Konstantin, 335
 Dunning, Miss, 39
Dun's Review, 134

Eastern Shore Times, 388
 Eastman, Max, 336
 Edison, T. A., 317
Editor and Publisher, 237
 Edmunds, G. F., 208 f.
 Edmunds, J. M., 110
 Edrop, P. T., 379
 Edwards, Fred, 379
 Elliott, John, 389
 Emerson, R. W., 12
Estelline Bell, 220
 Evarts, W. M., 150, 163
Evening Post (Chicago), 378
Evening Post (N.Y.), 4, 10, 23, 33, 56, 62, 102, 109, 132, 143, 188, 207, 209, 211, 221, 229, 236, 258, 272, 277 f., 344, 360, 378, 388
Evening Sun (N.Y.), 306, 344, 382
Evening Telegram (N.Y.), 344, 382
Evening World (N.Y.), 344
Express (N.Y.), 4, 33

 Fechter, Charles, 229
 Fenton, Reuben, 96 f.
 Fergusson, A. R., 379
 Fessenden, W. P., 56 f., 64
 Field, Carter, 334, 356
 Field, Eugene, 212, 291
 Fisher, Warren, 157, 210
 Fisk, James, 91
 Fitzwater, Fanny Fern, 393
 Flower, R. P., 192
 Folger, Charles, 204
 Folwell, Arthur, 292
 Forbes, Archibald, 77, 131
 Ford, I. N., 133 f., 224
 Forrest, Wilbur, 340 f., 356, 371, 386, 390
 Fourierism, 15, 16 f., 34
 Fowler, G. F., 64, 111
 Franz Ferdinand, Archduke, 301
 Frohman, Daniel, 26, 82
 Fry, W. H., 11, 16, 27
 Fuller, Margaret, 10
 Furniss, Harry, 132

 Gannett, Lewis, 377
 Garfield, J. A., 72, 111, 194 f., 201, 203 f., 215, 255
 Garibaldi, G., 33, 329
 Garland, A. H., 213
 Garrett, Gare, 299 f., 334, 336, 339, 342 f., 377 f.
 Garrison, L. M., 315, 319
 Garvan, C. L., 305
 Gay, S. H., 16, 20, 26 f., 36
Gazette (Cincinnati), 69 f., 230
 George, Henry, 33
 Gibson, Randall, 163
 Gilbert, Clinton, 276 f., 287 f., 298 f., 332 f.
 Gillam, Bernard, 210
 Gilman, D. C., 143
 Gilman, Lawrence, 376
 Glass, G. W., 356

- Glass, Montague, 292
 Gleason, Arthur, 334
Globe (N.Y.), 344, 387
Globe-Democrat (St. Louis), 291
 Godkin, E. L., 102, 122, 132, 136, 150, 207, 209, 211, 258
 Godwin, Parke, 136, 139
Golden Age, 106
Golden Argosy, 381
 Gordon-Smith, G., 305
 Gould, Jay, 91, 121 f., 134, 146, 189, 232, 237
 Grant, U. S., 59 f.; secretary of war, 61; candidacy in 1868, 64 f.; at Shiloh, 69, 80; problems of first administration, 87 f.; cabinet, 90; and Black Friday, 91; and San Domingo, 91 f.; and Ku Klux Klan, 94 f.; quarrel with Greeley, 96 f.; on Missouri Liberals, 102; campaign of 1872, 104 f., 111, 114; at Greeley's funeral, 116; supporters seek control of *Tribune*, 120 f.; *Tribune* on second inaugural of, 146 f.; scandals, Southern policy, 147; currency policy, 148 f.; "Caesarism," 153 f.; effect on Hayes's administration, 160, 165 f.; presidential boom in 1880, 193 f., 198, 215, 351; Greeley, Horace, 2 f.; early life, 5 f.; first publications, 6 f.; political ideas, 7 f.; as newsgatherer, 9 f.; personality, 11 f.; as editorial writer, 15; social and economic ideas, 16 f.; on slavery, 18 f.; in the *Tribune*, 1865-1868, 24 f., 31, 34 f., 38, 40; on reconstruction, 41 f.; on assassination of Lincoln, 47; on status of negro, 47 f.; effect of *Tribune's* correspondents, 49 f.; Universal Amnesty and Impartial Suffrage, 50 f.; and Andrew Johnson, 52 f.; senatorial candidate, 54 f.; and Jeff. Davis, 56 f.; on military rule, 59; on impeachment, 60 f.; style, 62 f.; accepts Grant as candidate, 65; and Whitelaw Reid, 67 f., 70 f.; and J. R. Young, 72 f.; and Reid as manager, 74 f., 77, 79 f., 82; on college graduates, 83 f.; and John Hay, 85 f.; on Grant's first administration, 88 f.; feud with Conkling, 96 f.; opposes renomination of Grant, 99; and Liberal movement, 101 f.; candidacy, 105 f.; returns to *Tribune*, 114 f.; death, 116 f.; significance to *Tribune*, 118 f., 125, 127, 134, 136, 143, 145, 152, 164; labor policies, 175 f.; and Typographical Union, 182 f., 198 f., 207, 219, 221, 257, 265 f., 286, 351, 353, 362, 384, 386, 396
 Greeley, Ida, 120
 Greeley, Mrs. Mary Cheney, 113
 Greeley, Zaccheus, 5, 17
 Gregory, T. W., 332
 Gresham, W. Q., 256
 Grey, Sir Edward, 309
 Grimes, J. W., 63
 Grinnell, Moses, 100
 Grosvenor, W. M., 134, 171 f., 221
 Gruening, E. H., 299
 Guiteau, C. J., 203 f., 255
 Hale, Eugene, 170
 Halstead, Murat, 102, 107 f., 127, 150
 Hamilton, Gail (M. A. Dodge), 136, 166
 Hammond, Percy, 376
 Hampton, Wade, 136
 Hance, Joseph, 33, 77 f.
 Hancock, W. S., 61, 106, 196 f.
 Hand, Learned, 290 f.
 Hanna, M. A., 252, 273
 Harding, W. G., 320, 368 f.
Harper's Weekly, 208 f., 376
 Harriman, E. H., 271
 Harrison, Benjamin, 194, 215 f., 240 f., 256, 274
 Harrison, W. H., 7, 207
 Harte, Bret, 86, 122, 139
 Harvey, W. H., 222
 Hassard, J. R. G., 27 f., 114 f., 128, 134 f., 140, 171 f., 220, 228
 Hastings, Hugh, 117 f.
 Hatch, J. P., 50
 Havas, 34
 Hay, John, 38; joins *Tribune*, 70, 85 f.; supports W. Reid, 120, 122 f., 128; leaves *Tribune*, 134 f.; recommends Henry James, 137 f.; politics, 146, 148 f., 156, 165, 199, 201; editor of

- Tribune*, 202 f., 217, 220, 242; in State Department, 260, 262, 273
- Hayes, R. B., 70; campaign of 1876, 155, 158; disputed election, 159 f.; southern policy, 163 f.; civil service, 165 f.; Potter Committee, 168; cipher dispatches, 174; effect of administration, 175, 193 f., 217
- Hearst, W. R., effect on press, 232 f.; Spanish-American War, 257, 265 f.; in World War, 321, 327; *Tribune's* fight against, 336 f., 342 f.; on League, 357, 371, 381
- Hendricks, T. A., 159
- Herald* (Boston), 209
- Herald* (Glasgow), 356
- Herald* (N.Y.), before 1865, 4 f., 7, 9 f., 13, 21; in 1865, 22, 33, 65, 72; in Franco-Prussian War, 76, 79, 83; circulation, 1868-1872, 125 f., 129; on Grant, 152, 185, 201, 209; competition of yellow press, 234 f.; of *Times*, 265 f., 277 f., 294, 375, 377, 379; purchased by Munsey, 381 f.; by *Tribune*, 382 f., 389
- Herald Tribune* (N.Y.), 16, 232, 278 f., 288, 291 f., 299, 372, 375, 378 f.; consolidation, 382 f.; building, 385; administration, 385 f.; editorial page, 387 f.; foreign news, 388 f.; *Paris Herald Tribune*, 389; local news, 390 f.; Syndicate, 393; women in, 393 f.; mechanical departments, 394 f.; publisher's department, 395 f.
- Herald Tribune* (Paris), 382 f., 386, 389 f.
- Hildreth, Richard, 16, 20
- Hill, D. B., 243
- Hill, J. J., 271
- Hill, W. E., 292
- Hilles, C. D., 322
- Hills, Laurence, 389
- Hiscock, Frank, 171
- Hitchcock, Ripley, 231
- Hobart, G. A., 255
- Hoffman, J. T., 116
- Holcombe, A. R., 388
- Holden, E. S., 172
- Holden, W. W., 94
- Holt, Joseph, 61
- Hoover, Herbert, 333, 366 f.
- Hope, Edward, 378
- Horgan, S. H., 235
- Horr, R. G., 222
- Houghton, W. M., 279
- House, Edward, 27
- Houssaye, Arsène, 137 f.
- Howard, O. O., 61
- Hughes, C. E., 320 f., 359, 361, 369
- Huneker, J. G., 227 f.
- Hunt, Bampton, 355
- Hunt, R. M., 126
- Huntington, W. H., 33, 39, 137 f.
- Hutchinson, Ellen Mackay (see Cortissoz, Mrs. Royal)
- Hylan, John, 346, 364
- Ibsen, Henrik, 228
- James, Henry, 138
- Jeffersonian*, 6 f., 15
- Joffre, J. J. C., 328
- Johnson, Andrew, 37, 41; succeeds Lincoln, 47 f.; conservatism, 51 f.; impeachment of, 59 f.; impeachment fails, 64, 71, 88, 96
- Johnson, Hiram, 324
- Johnson, Oliver, 25 f.
- Johnson, W. F., 221, 276, 377
- Jones, George, 125, 265
- Jones, Neal, 379
- Journal* (N.Y.), 234, 237 f., 254, 257 f., 265, 293, 345
- Journal of Commerce* (N.Y.), 4, 33, 246 f., 272
- Julian, G. W., 47, 102
- Keeler, Ralph, 133
- Kelley, W. D., 111, 149
- Kellogg, W. P., 147
- Key, D. M., 163
- Kimmel, Esther, 393
- Kingsbury, Harry, 289 f.
- Knappen, T. M., 334, 356
- Knox, P. C., 270
- Krehbiel, Henry, 227, 230 f., 278, 335 f., 376
- Ladies' Home Journal*, 293
- Laffan, W. F., 225 f., 269

- La Follette, Robert, 336
 Lamar, L. Q. C., 163
 Lamar, W. H., 336, 343
 Lamont, Daniel, 212
 Lang, Elsa, 393
 Leavitt, Mrs. Helen W., 393
 Lee, J. M., 62
 Lee, R. E., 1, 9
 Leet, G. K., 100
Leslie's Weekly, 279
 Liliuokalani, Queen, 256
 Lincoln, Abraham, 1, 9 f.; and Greeley, 12, 24, 26; death reported, 37 f.; amnesty policy, 42 f., 45; effect of death, 46 f., 51 f., 68, 96, 106, 215, 325, 340, 351
 Lincoln, Robert, 208
 Lindbergh, C. A., 386, 390
 Lingley, E. K., 391
 Linotype, 191, 201, 394
 Lippmann, Walter, 391, 393, 396
Literary Digest, 279, 384
 Livingstone, David, 129
 Lloyd, D. D., 224
 Lloyd, H. D., 106
 Lloyd George, David, 355 f.
 Lodge, H. C., 146, 337
 Logan, J. A., 135, 149, 194
Log Cabin, 6 f., 15, 207
 Louis Philippe, 179
 Lovejoy, E. P., 19, 68
 Lowden, F. O., 368
Lusitania, 306, 309 f., 314, 320, 333
 Lyman, Hart, 221, 274 f., 279, 287
 Lynch, D. T., 279, 294
- MacAlarney, R. E., 293, 379
 Macaulay, T. B., 129
McCall's Magazine, 377
 McClellan, G. B., 9
 McClendon, Charles, 391
 McCloy, W. C., 287, 299
McClure's Magazine, 296
 McComb, H. S., 111
 McCulloch, Hugh, 136
 McElrath, Thomas, 13, 35, 386
 McFarland, Daniel, 82
 MacFarland, Hood, 379
 McGeehan, W. O., 293 f., 378, 383
 MacGowan, Kenneth, 342
- McKane, J. Y., 249
 McKinley, William, 224; tariff bill, 241 f., 244; campaign of 1896, 252 f.; Spanish-American War, 257 f., 261; and Platt, 262; in 1900, 263 f.; assassination, 267 f., 273
 McPherson, Edward, 134, 276
 McPherson, William, 276 f., 334
Mail (N.Y.), 291, 299, 344
 Marble, Manton, 23, 62 f., 102, 169 f.
 Mario, Jessie White, 33
 "Marjorie's Battleship," 316 f.
 Marquis, Don, 378
 Martin, James, 274
 Marx, Karl, 9, 31
 Mason, Julian, 378 f., 388
Masses, 335
 Maxim, Hudson, 318
 Maynard, I. H., 249
 Meeker, N. C., 11, 17, 29
 Mejanel, M., 77, 79
 Meloney, Mrs. W. B., 375, 393
 Mergenthaler, Ottmar, 191
Metropolitan Magazine, 320
 Milholland, J. F., 222, 249 f.
 Miller, Joaquin, 86
 Miller, Warner, 243
 Millis, Walter, 387
 Mills, D. O., 201, 237, 282
 Mills, Elisabeth, (see Reid, Mrs. White-law)
Mirror (N.Y.), 391, 393
 Mitchell, E. P., 269, 381
 Moltke, H. von, 76
 Moore, E. B., 83
 Moore, Frederick, 355, 360
 Morgan, Gerald, 302
 Morgan, J. P., 223, 253, 272
Morning Post (London), 302
Morning Post (N.Y.), 4, 6
Morning Post (Philadelphia), 73
Morning Telegraph (N.Y.), 393
 Morton, L. P., 243, 251, 253 f.
 Morton, Oliver, 89, 101, 149
 Most, Johann, 267
 Motley, J. L., 93
 Muller, Gustav, 77, 79
 Mulligan, James, 157 f., 207 f., 210
 Munsey, F. A., 224, 226, 380 f., 389
Munsey's Magazine, 381

- Murchison, Charles, 216
 Murlin, E. L., 225
 Murphy, C. F., 317
 Murphy, Thomas, 96 f.

 Napoleon III, 76, 78, 137
 Nast, Thomas, 91, 108, 110, 146, 152, 196, 198, 208 f.
Nation, 71, 99, 102, 108, 132, 143 f., 255
New Republic, 360
News (Baltimore), 387
News (N.Y.), 385
News (Xenia), 68 f.
New-Yorker, 6 f., 15, 18 f.
 Nicholson, Donald, 217, 220 f., 274
 Niles, Hezekiah, 8
 Niles, T. E., 299
 Nordhoff, Charles, 150, 158
North American Review, 376
 Northcliffe, Lord, 281 f.
Northern Spectator, 5 f., 68

 O'Brien, John, 391
 Ochs, Adolph, 130, 220, 265 f., 380 f.
 Odell, B. B., 264, 273
 O'Donnell, J. R., 186
 Orr, William, 279
 Orton, William, 120 f., 123, 150
 Ottarson, F. J., 26

 Packard, S. B., 164
Pall Mall Gazette, 77
 Palmer, Frederick, 305
 Papen, F. von, 335
 Parcells, Eugene, 291
 Parke, T. W., 154
 Parker, A. B., 273
 Parsons, Geoffrey, 299, 364, 371, 387
 Parton, James, 183
 Paterson, Isabel, 377
 Patterson, J. W., 111
 Pearce, George, 127
 Pearson, Judge, 94
 Pelton, W. T., 169 f., 173
 Perrin, D. S., 379
 Perry, M. G., 9
 Pershing, J. J., 330, 334
 Phelps, W. W., 121, 149 f., 202 f., 207 f., 211

 Phillips, Wendell, 56 f.
 Pike, J. S., 10, 16, 147
 Pitney, Fred, 293, 305, 336
 Platt, T. C., elected to Senate, 199 f.; resigns, 203 f., 218, 222, 225, 235; in power again, 243 f.; fight with Reid, 248 f., 253 f., 261 f.; power broken, 264, 273
 Pope, John, 61
 Porter, Horace, 192
 Porter, R. B., 206
Post (Detroit), 169
Post (San Francisco), 294
Press (N.Y.), 222, 250 f., 261, 277, 381 f.
 Press, New York City, geographical advantages, 3 f., 14; sixpenny press, 4; cheap press, 4 f.; politics, 1841, 7; forms Associated Press, 14; in 1865, 23; in 1872, 124 f.; revolutionized by Pulitzer, 232 f.; and Theodore Roosevelt, 272; in Publishers' Association, 344 f.; moves from Park Row, 379; in 1912, 380 f.; Munsey's mergers, 381 f.
Press (Philadelphia), 28
 Press Wireless, 389
 Pryor, R. A., 45
Puck (N.Y.), 210, 292
 Pulitzer, Joseph, methods, 130, 219, 134; purchases *World*, 232 f.; on Pullman strike, 248; Spanish-American War, 257, 261, 265 f.; and *Tribune*, 276, 279, 371, 381
 Pulitzer, Ralph, 381
Punch (London), 41, 132

 Quigg, L. E., 222, 224

 Rascoe, Burton, 377
 Rawlins, J. A., 90
 Raymond, Henry J., 13, 17, 22, 56, 96, 116, 124, 265
 Reade, Charles, 138 f.
Recorder (N.Y.), 254
Reformer (Watertown), 105
Register (Des Moines), 294
 Reick, W. C., 381
 Reid, Elisabeth, 373
 Reid, J. C., 160

- Reid, Ogden Mills, 274, 278; enters *Tribune*, 281 f.; managing editor, 282 f.; editor-in-chief, 287 f., 293, 299, 306, 308, 351, 370; and Helen Rogers Reid, 372 f.; purchase of *Herald*, 382 f.; in *Herald Tribune*, 385 f., 396
- Reid, Mrs. Ogden Mills (Helen Rogers Reid), early life, 372 f.; enters *Tribune*, 373; advertising director, 373 f., 378; purchase of *Herald*, 382 f.; in *Herald Tribune*, 386 f., 393, 395 f.
- Reid, Robert, 67
- Reid, Whitelaw, 25; early life, 67 f.; enters *Tribune*, 71 f.; managing editor, 74 f.; on college graduates, 83 f.; and John Hay, 85 f.; in Grant's first administration, 91 f., 95; at Cincinnati, 105 f.; temporary editor of *Tribune*, 109, 112; Greeley returns, 115; attacked by Dana, 117 f.; fight for control of *Tribune*, 119 f.; task in 1873, 124 f.; builds Tall Tower, 126 f.; journalistic ideas, 129 f.; emphasis on arts and letters, 136 f.; on Sunday edition, 144; political ideas, 145 f.; Republican overtures, 149 f.; third party, 150 f.; and Tilden, 151 f.; campaign of 1876, 155 f., 159; disputed election, 162; letter to Hayes, 163; on civil service, 165 f., 168; cipher dispatches, 170 f.; economic and labor ideas, 177 f.; Typographical Union strike, 183 f.; dissatisfied with Hayes, 194; relations with Garfield, 195 f., 199, 201; marriage, 201 f.; returns to *Tribune*, 204, 206; campaign of 1884, 209 f.; of 1888, 215; minister to France, 217; absentee owner, 218 f.; and Associated Press, 225 f.; critical policy, 227, 229 f.; and yellow press, 232 f.; Fresh Air Fund, 236; stock in *Tribune*, 237, 240; campaign of 1892, 242 f.; fight with Platt, 248 f., 253, 261 f., 273; campaign of 1896, 253; colonial policy, 257, 260 f.; and Roosevelt, 261, 265; conservatism, 267; Roosevelt administration, 269 f., 272; ambassador to Great Britain, 273; sets up regency, 274 f.; comparison with Ogden Reid, 282, 287 f.; death, 286, 362, 365, 370, 377, 385, 388
- Reid, Mrs. Whitelaw, 201 f., 237, 287 f., 372
- Reid, Whitelaw II, 373
- Remington, Frederick, 257
- Repington, Colonel, 305
- Republican* (Springfield), 99, 102, 155, 209
- Reuter, 34
- Review of Reviews*, 306
- Rhodes, J. F., 21
- Rice, Grantland, 293, 375
- Rich, Endicott, 391
- Richardson, A. D., 9, 26, 33, 45, 82
- Richardson, Mrs. A. D., 82
- Richardson, W. A., 147, 153
- Ridder, Herman, 308
- Ripley, George, 10, 20, 27, 29 f., 137, 139, 142, 278
- Roach, John, 213
- Robertson, W. H., 200 f., 203
- Robinson, Boardman, 277 f., 294, 307
- Robinson, Solon, 11
- Rogers, D. G., 392
- Rooker, Thomas, 34 f., 183
- Roosevelt, F. D., 369, 375
- Roosevelt, Mrs. F. D., 375
- Roosevelt, Nicholas, 387 f.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, 146; supports Edmunds, 209, 221, 224, 260; candidate for governor, 261 f.; in 1900, 263 f.; first administration, 267 f.; appoints Reid ambassador, 273 f., 277; campaign of 1912, 285; and World War, 317 f.; in 1916, 319 f.; Roosevelt Division, 328 f., 332; attacks Hearst, 344; on League, 357 f.; supported by *Tribune*, 365 f.; death, 366 f.
- Root, Elihu, 320 f.
- Rowell's *Newspaper Annual*, 124 f.
- Ruhl, Arthur, 376
- Runkle, C. A., 39
- Russell, William, 76, 79, 303
- Sackville-West, Lord, 216
- Salvini, Tommaso, 229
- Saxe, Joseph, 355 f.
- Schem, A. J., 29
- Schenck, R. C., 154

- Schurz, Carl, 27, 102, 107 f., 150, 163, 209
 Scott, Winfield, 20
 Seckendorff, Max, 224
 Segue, S. C., 356
 Seward, W. H., 6 f., 12, 46, 92, 96 f.
 Seymour, Horatio, 62, 65 f.
 Shanks, W. F. G., 72, 83, 133
 Shea, George, 56
 Shepard, H. D., 4
 Shepherd, A. R., 153 f.
 Sheridan, Philip, 60 f., 215
 Sherman, Isaac, 150
 Sherman, John, 194 f.
 Sherman, S. P., 377
 Sherman, W. T., 26 f., 60, 69, 351
 Sickles, D. E., 61
 Sigsbee, C. D., 317
 Simonds, F. L., 278, 305 f., 312, 343, 348, 354 f.
 Sinclair, Samuel, 35 f., 120 f., 123, 126, 395
 Smalley, E. V., 132, 224
 Smalley, G. W., 9 f., 26, 31 f., 76 f., 82 f., 131 f., 134, 214 f., 224, 305
 Smith, Gerrit, 56
 Smith, G. M., 378
 Smith, W. R., 278 f.
 Sprague, William, 121
Staats-Zeitung (N.Y.), 308, 344
 Stanbery, Henry, 60 f.
 Standard News Association, 388, 393
Standard (N.Y.), 97, 120
 Stanley, H. M., 129
 Stanton, E. M., 60 f., 63, 340
Star (Kansas City), 357
 Starrett, W. F., 294
 Staton, Harry, 393
 Stedman, E. C., 70, 84 f., 136
 Stereotyping, introduced in *Tribune*, 35; use of half-tones with, 235; in *Herald Tribune*, 394
 Sterrett, Marjorie, 317 f.
 Stevens, G. A., 190
 Stevens, Thaddeus, 41, 62, 70
 Stewart, A. T., 90
 Stewart, W. M., 240
 Stockton, F. R., 29
 Stockton, J. D., 29, 60, 73
 Stoer, C. B., 65
 Stone, C. L. (Mrs. John Hay), 134
 Stone, W. L., 75
 Story, Francis, 4, 6
 Stowe, Mrs. H. B., 136
 Strauss, Richard, 230
 Sullivan, Mark, 391
 Sumner, Charles, 62, 70, 92 f., 102
Sun (N.Y.), founded, 4 f., 7; in 1865, 22 f.; in Associated Press, 33; attacks Young, 72 f.; in Franco-Prussian War, 76, 79; in campaign of 1872, 102, 111, 113; attacks Reid, 117 f., 122; in 1872, 124 f., 129, 135; on Reid, 146; disputed election, 162 f., 169, 173; on Garfield, 198; on Hay, 203; and Associated Press, 225 f.; supports B. F. Butler, 234, 238; supports Platt, 251; and *Times*, 265 f.; and Roosevelt, 269, 272, 277, 278; on *Tribune*, 291, 299, 304, 344, 378 f.; bought by Munsey, 381 f., 387
 Taft, W. H., 277, 284 f., 369
 Taylor, Bayard, 9 f., 16, 25, 33, 123, 137, 174
 Taylor, Mrs. Bayard, 142
 Taylor, Deems, 292 f.
 Thayer, W. R., 202, 329
This Week, 375, 393
 Thomas, Augustus, 229
 Thomas, Lorenzo, 61, 63
 Thompson, Dorothy, 391
 Thompson, W. P., 185 f., 191
 Thurman, A. G., 155, 198
 Tilden, Samuel, 101 f., 132, 151 f., 154 f., 159 f., 168 f., 175
 Tilton, Theodore, 67, 106 f., 133
Times (Chattanooga), 265
Times (London), 34, 109, 131, 141, 224
Times (Los Angeles), 216
Times (New Orleans), 71
Times (N.Y.), founded, 13; and *Tribune*, 17, 21; in 1865, 22; in Associated Press, 33; on Jeff. Davis, 45 f., 56, 71, 79; and Tweed, 80, 98; on Reid, 84, 146; in campaign of 1872, 109 f., 113; on Greeley, 118; in 1872, 124 f., 129; and Republicans, 149; disputed election, 160; in campaign of 1884, 208 f., 220; effect of yellow press, 234;

- rejuvenation, 265 f., 281, 291; in World War, 303, 311, 344, 352, 379; in 1912, 380 f., 383 f., 392
- Times* (Washington), 277
- Tirpitz, A. von, 308
- Titanic*, 383 f.
- Tobenkin, Elias, 355
- Towns, M. L., 226 f.
- Towse, J. R., 229
- Transcript* (Boston), 209
- Traveller* (Boston), 299
- Tribunal*, 295
- Tribune Almanac*, 16, 134, 276 f.
- Tribune Association*, 17, 35, 39, 103, 119 f., 185 f., 386
- Tribune* (Chicago), 22, 99, 102, 203, 388 f., 393
- Tribune Farmer*, 281
- Tribune Fresh Air Fund*, 236 f.
- Tribune Illustrated Supplement*, 235 f., 280, 292, 395
- Tribune Inc.*, 237, 280, 383, 385 f.
- Tribune Index*, 141
- Tribune Magazine*, 236, 280, 292, 377, 393
- Tribune* (N.Y.), *Growth before 1865*, geographical factors, 3 f., 14 f.; cheap press, 4 f.; Horace Greeley, 5 f., 11 f.; political factors, 7 f.; enterprise, 8 f.; editorials and "isms," 15 f.; slavery question, 18 f.
- Last years of Greeley*, competition, 22 f.; rising costs, 23; Greeley's methods, 24 f.; the staff, 25 f.; Young reorganizes, 28 f.; editorial staff, 29; local news, 29 f.; out-of-town news, 31 f.; Associated Press, 33 f.; mechanical departments, 34 f.; publisher's department, 35 f.; style and appearance, 36 f.; position on reconstruction, 41 f.; on Lincoln, 43 f.; his death, 46 f.; Johnson's administration, 47 f.; on impeachment, 59 f.; campaign of 1868, 63 f.; Reid joins staff, 71 f.; Young resigns, 73 f.; Reid as manager, 74 f.; Franco-Prussian War, 75 f.; enterprise in local newsgathering, 79 f.; college men, 83 f.; Hay, 85 f.; on Grant's problems, 87 f.; his cabinet, 90; Black Friday, 90 f.; San Domingo, 91 f.; Southern question, 94 f.; fight with Grant, 95 f.; Liberal movement, 101 f.; Greeley a candidate, 108 f.; Reid temporary editor, 109 f.; campaign of 1872, 110 f.; Greeley returns, 114; "Crumbs of Comfort," 114 f.; Greeley's death, 116 f.; fight for succession, 118 f.
- Reid's editorship*, situation in 1873, 124 f.; new building, 126 f.; Reid's ideas of journalism, 129 f.; staff, 131 f.; intellectual interests, 136 f.; political independence, 145 f.; support of Tilden, 151 f.; and Blaine, 155 f.; campaign of 1876, 158 f.; disputed election, 160 f.; Hayes's administration, 163 f.; cipher dispatches, 168 f.; economic and labor policies, 176 f.; Typographical Union strike, 182 f.; campaign of 1880, 193 f.; Stalwart-Half-Breed feud, 199 f.; Hay temporary editor, 202 f.; campaign of 1884, 207 f.; Cleveland's first administration, 211 f.; campaign of 1888, 215 f.; absentee ownership, 217 f.; editorial staff, 220 f.; Associated Press, 225 f.; critical staff, 227 f.; effect of yellow press, 234 f.; profits and circulation, 237 f.; Harrison's administration, 240 f.; campaign of 1892, 242 f.; Cleveland's second administration, 245 f.; fight with Platt, 248 f.; campaign of 1896, 252 f.; imperialism, 255 f.; campaigns of 1899 and 1900, 261 f.; competition of *Times*, 265 f.; Roosevelt's first administration, 267 f.; Reid ambassador to Great Britain, 273; Hart Lyman editor, 274 f.; Ogden Reid, 281 f.; managing editor, 283 f.; death of Whitelaw Reid, 286
- Editorship of Ogden Reid*, 287 f.; Burdick-Curtin case, 289 f.; introduction of features, 291 f.; style and personnel, 293 f.; campaign for truth in advertising, 295 f.; changes in make-up, 299 f.; World War, 301 f.; news sources, 302 f.; hostility to Germany, 306 f.; effect of *Lusitania* sinking,

- 310 f.; preparedness campaign, 314 f.; campaign of 1916, 319 f.; United States in war, 324 f.; war program, 326 f.; censorship, 330 f.; impatience, 331 f., news services improved, 333 f.; campaign against sedition, 334 f.; attack on administration, 337 f.; attack on Hearst, 336 f., 342 f.; on armistice terms, 346 f.; on Fourteen Points, 351 f.; on League, 355 f.; other peace terms, 359 f.; on Prohibition, 362 f.; economic unrest, 363 f.; campaign of 1920, 365 f.; circulation and standing in 1918, 371 f.; Helen Rogers Reid, 373 f.; changes after 1918, 375 f.; new building, 379 f.; effect of Munsey, 380 f.; purchase of *Herald*, 382 f. (see *Herald Tribune*, N.Y.)
Tribune, Sunday Edition, 141 f., 235 f., 280, 292 f., 375 f., 395
Tribune Syndicate, 291 f., 383, 386, 391, 393
 Trumbull, Lyman, 64, 102, 107 f.
 Turnbull, Hector, 376
 Twain, Mark (S. L. Clemens), 33, 86, 122, 136, 243
Twinkles, Sunday Supplement, 235
 Typographical Union No. 6, 17, 118, 128, 177, 182 f., 211
- Underhill, Harriette, 376
Union Printer (see also *Boycotter*), 191 f.
 United Press, 225 f., 340, 388, 393
- Vallandigham, C. L., 101, 152
 Van de Water, F. F., 377
 Van Doren, Irita, 378, 393
 Villard, Henry, 10, 31, 76
- Wade, B. F., 41 f., 47, 65, 70
 Wadsworth, J. W., 337
 Wagner, Richard, 140, 230
 Walker, Stanley, 379, 383, 391 f., 396
 Wallace, Lew, 69
 Wallen, T. C., 391
 Wardman, Ervin, 381
 Warner, A. L., 391
 Warner, C. D., 121
- Warren, Arthur, 278
 Washburne, Elihu, 90, 155
 Watterson, Henry, 73, 101 f., 165, 167 f., 113, 119, 131, 150, 161, 198, 218
 Watts, Richard, Jr., 376
 Weaver, J. B., 178
 Webster, C. T., 292, 375
 Weed, Clive, 294
 Weed, Thurlow, 6 f., 12, 96 f., 136
 Weinheimer, John, 141
 Wells, D. A., 150
 Wells, Edgar, 150
Westliche Post (St. Louis), 133
 Wheeler, W. A., 158
Whig Almanac and Political Register, 16
 White, Holt, 77 f.
 White, Horace, 102, 106 f., 122
 White, Zebulon, 81, 83, 132, 290
 Whitman, Walt, 139
 Whitney, Caspar, 338, 341
 Whitney, W. C., 213
 Wickersham, G. W., 355 f., 369
 Wilcox, G. S., 388, 394
 Wilkeson, Samuel, 10, 26 f., 46 f.
 Willard, Frances, 236
 William I, 78 f.
 William II, 294, 302
 Wilson, Henry, 20, 111, 116
 Wilson, James, 20
 Wilson, Woodrow, 42; in 1912, 285; Burdick-Curtin case, 290; British blockade, 308; *Lusitania* sinking, 310 f.; preparedness, 314 f., 318 f.; campaign of 1916, 319 f.; declaration of war, 324 f.; Roosevelt Division, 329 f.; conduct of war, 332 f., 337 f., 342; armistice negotiations, 347 f.; Fourteen Points, 351 f.; at Versailles, 355 f., 360 f., 365, 367; in 1920, 369 f.
- Windom, William, 194
 Winkler, J. K., 336, 344
 Winslow, K. R., 395
 Winter, William, 27, 29, 135, 140, 227 f., 278, 392
 Wolff, 34
 Wood, Leonard, 367 f.
 Woodford, S. L., 97
 Woods, Dr., 34
 Woolley, C. W., 170, 173

- World*, (N.Y.), 9, 21, 23, 33, 62 f., 79,
102, 108, 124 f., 161, 169, 190, 216,
232, 234, 237 f., 248, 254, 257 f., 272,
276, 280, 285, 291, 294, 318, 327, 344,
366, 379 f., 383
Wright, C. M., 355
Young, James Rankin, 31, 63
Young, John Russell, 20; managing
editor, 28 f., 36; effect on *Tribune's*
policies, 54, 60 f.; on Grant, 65; and
Reid, 70 f.; leaves *Tribune*, 72 f., 86;
92, 97, 120, 123, 125, 183, 395